

**MARTIN OF OPAVA AND THE TREATMENT OF
IMPERIAL HISTORY IN DOMINICAN WORKS OF
COMPILATION, *c.* 1250-1330**

Elisabeth Rolston

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of
Arts in History, University of Canterbury

2018

Senior supervisor: Dr. Chris Jones

Associate supervisor: Dr. Gary Morrison

Abstract

The late-thirteenth century *Chronicon Pontificum et Imperatorum* of the Dominican friar Martin of Opava, also known as Martin of Troppau, proved to be one of the most popular and influential universal chronicles of the later Middle Ages. It was produced at a time when the practical authority of the western empire had collapsed and the universal claims of both empire and papacy were beginning to be questioned in the universities. Despite its medieval popularity, however, the *Chronicon*'s concept of empire has received at best only cursory attention from scholars. It has a reputation for being derivative, unoriginal, and poorly written. This thesis explores Martin's vision of empire through his presentation of imperial history. It examines his treatment of the character and conduct of Christian emperors and his interpretation of the empire's role according to the 'two swords' theory that advocated for the dual rule of Christendom by pope and emperor. It considers Martin's understanding in the context of the Dominican historiographical tradition in the later Middle Ages, drawing comparisons with the way imperial history was presented by his thirteenth-century contemporaries Vincent of Beauvais and James of Voragine and by two early-fourteenth century friars who consulted the *Chronicon*, Ptolemy of Lucca and Bernard Gui. This comparison reveals that Martin's *Chronicon* presents a carefully constructed vision of empire that was distinct from those of his brethren, one that reflected a complex and developed understanding of the role of the emperor in Christendom. Furthermore, it sheds light on the transmission of political ideas within the Dominican Order's encyclopaedic projects. It reveals the extent to which each friar's particular context influenced his vision of empire, demonstrating, in particular, that Martin's *Chronicon* represents a valuable perspective within the Dominican historiographical tradition, one that reflects his unique background as a papal chaplain and penitentiary.

Table of Contents

<i>Abstract</i>	3
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	7
<i>Note on translations</i>	9
<i>List of abbreviations</i>	11
Introduction	13
Historiography.....	15
Methodology.....	21
Chapter Structure.....	26
Chapter 1: The Role of the Emperor	29
The Construction of Legitimacy.....	30
Peace and Conquest.....	33
Justice and Law.....	36
Imperial Piety.....	38
Chapter 2: <i>Duo Gladii</i>: Papal-Imperial Relations in the <i>Chronicon</i>	47
Martin's Two Swords.....	49
Cooperation: The Constantinian Model.....	53
Conflict and Excommunication.....	56
Chapter 3: <i>Frater Martinus Ordinis Praedicatorum</i>: The <i>Chronicon</i> and its Context	65
Dominican Influences on Martin.....	67
The Importance of Empire.....	72
Virtue and Vice: Noteworthy Emperors.....	76
Chapter 4: Continuity and Variation: Imperial Ideology in Fourteenth-Century Dominican Chronicles	85
The Place of Empire in the <i>Annales</i> and <i>Flores chronicorum</i>	88
Departure from Martin's Vision of Emperorship.....	97
Conclusion	105
Bibliography	109

Acknowledgements

I am very grateful to have received a UC Master's Scholarship for the first year of my MA. I am also thankful to the Australian and New Zealand Association for Medieval and Early Modern Studies (ANZAMEMS) for a travel bursary to attend their 2017 conference and Postgraduate Advanced Training Seminar (PATS) in Wellington, which aided my professional development in the early stages of this degree; and to the Religious History Association for funding which supported my attendance at their 2017 'Gender, Devotion and the Body' PATS in Melbourne, which provided me with valuable feedback and stimulating discussion.

I owe a debt of gratitude to my senior supervisor, Chris Jones, who first introduced me to Martin and who has patiently guided the resulting thesis to its final form. I have benefited greatly from his feedback and expertise. I would also like to extend my thanks to Gary Morrison for his time and additional comments.

Throughout this thesis, I was incredibly fortunate to have the support of my fellow medievalists at UC: Derek Whaley, who has always been willing to offer advice, answer questions, and discuss medieval rulers; Thandi Parker, my go-to proofreader and idea-bouncer; and Anna Milne-Tavendale, who has shared her knowledge of early Dominicans. All three have provided feedback and suggestions at various stages.

I owe the best parts of my MA experience to my officemates, particularly Amy Duff, Nick Foss, Jonathan Anderson, Tom Gilmour, Holly Easton, Daniel Steel, and Kyle Gibson. They have provided the companionship and camaraderie that made coming into the office every day a joy and offered their support through the ups and downs of the past eighteen months. I am very lucky to have found myself part of such a wonderful postgraduate community.

Finally, I would like to thank my off-campus support network – my non-historian friends for their encouragement, friendship, and willingness to listen to me talk about friars and emperors; my partner, who has been my most enthusiastic and understanding supporter; and my parents, who have encouraged me to pursue my passions despite thinking I should probably get a job instead. Thanks for having my back.

Note on Translations

All translations from Latin in this thesis are my own unless otherwise indicated. This is primarily out of necessity in the frequent cases where no English translation of the text has been published. For texts that have been translated, use of the Latin edition is generally preferred for effective comparison between texts.

List of abbreviations

MGH – *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*

SS – *Scriptores*

SS. rer. Germ. – *Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum separatim editi*

SS. rer. Germ. N.S. – *Scriptores rerum Germanicarum, Nova series*

Fontes iuris – *Fontes iuris Germanici antiqui in usum scholarum separatim editi*

Const. - *Constitutiones et acta publica imperatorum et regum*

RHGF – *Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France*

BnF – *Bibliothèque nationale de France*

Introduction

When the Dominican inquisitor Bernard Gui sat down to compile his *Flores chronicorum* in 1314, he had a range of chronicles from which to choose his ‘flowers’. Both the *Chronique latine* of Guillaume de Nangis and the *Memoriale historiarum* of John of Saint-Victor, for example, offered Bernard the option of recently-completed universal chronicles by French writers sympathetic, like Bernard, to the Capetian kings.¹ Instead, he drew from the *Chronicon Pontificum et Imperatorum* of Martinus Polonus, known to modern scholars as Martin of Opava or Martin of Troppau. By the time Bernard wrote, the last recension of Martin’s *Chronicon* was nearly forty years old. It was the product of a Bohemian friar based at the papal Curia in Rome who stood in stark contrast to Bernard, who wrote in a southern French environment marked by heresy. The value of Martin’s work lay partly in the fact it was produced by a fellow Dominican. The *Flores* also drew heavily from the works of three other members of Bernard’s order: the *Speculum historiale* of Vincent of Beauvais and the *Chronicon universale* of Gerald Frachet, and to a lesser extent the *Historia ecclesiastica nova* of Ptolemy of Lucca.² Yet Martin’s *Chronicon* had also, by this point, become a standard foundational text for universal chroniclers, ubiquitous in monastic libraries across Europe.³ Bernard’s decision to include Martin’s *Chronicon* amongst his ‘flowers of the chronicles’ is just one example of the importance of this text in the later Middle Ages. The *Chronicon*, a simple, succinct papal-imperial chronicle, proved to be the most popular work of its genre and survives in over 500 extant manuscripts.⁴ This thesis will use the *Chronicon*’s presentation of imperial history to explore its compiler’s view of empire and the role of the emperor, and to situate this view within the milieu of the early Dominican Order.

The *Chronicon* features side-by-side accounts of contemporary popes and emperors, beginning with Christ and Augustus and concluding with the sitting pope at the time of

¹ The last recension of Guillaume’s chronicle was completed by 1300 and the first recension of John’s was available by 1308: see M. Chazan, *L’Empire et l’histoire universelle de Sigebert de Gembloux à Jean de Saint-Victor*, Paris, Honoré Champion, 1999, pp. 379-387 for an overview of Guillaume’s chronicle, and for John’s, pp. 387-396.

² For a discussion of Bernard’s sources that focuses on his *Reges francorum* but notes their use in the *Flores*, see A. M. Lamarrigue, *Bernard Gui (1261-1331): Un historien et sa méthode*, Paris, Honoré Champion, 2000, pp. 92-104.

³ Anna-Dorothee von den Brincken notes that ‘it was more widely read, copied, continued and translated than any other historical work of the period, and there are few major universal histories of the subsequent centuries which did not use it as a source’: ‘Martin of Opava’, in G. Dunphy (ed.), *Encyclopedia of the Medieval Chronicle*, vol. 2, Leiden, Brill, 2010, p. 1087.

⁴ Von den Brincken, *Encyclopedia of the Medieval Chronicle*, p. 1085.

compilation.⁵ It is a clear reflection of a worldview which saw papacy and empire as the axes upon which Christendom turned – a worldview that was increasingly out of step with the reality of the power balance in Western Europe in the thirteenth century. When Martin completed the first recension of his chronicle in 1268, the imperial vacancy created by the death of Emperor Frederick II had already lasted eighteen years and would continue until the coronation of Henry VII in 1312. With no emperor on the throne following Frederick's death and the end of the Hohenstaufen dynasty, under which the medieval empire had reached the apex of its power, the practical authority of the empire collapsed.⁶ This collapse was accompanied by the questioning of the concept of a universal empire itself by some notable thinkers, with new ideas about political power circulating in particular at the burgeoning universities.⁷ Despite this, the belief that there was a unique and indispensable role for the emperor in the governance of Christendom endured and is illustrated by the prominence granted to the empire in universal histories such as Martin's *Chronicon*.

Central to thirteenth-century developments in political thought were the works of Dominican theologians such as Albert the Great and Thomas Aquinas, which synthesised Christian theology with the rediscovered political theory of Aristotle.⁸ Both the Dominican and Franciscan orders, which had grown exponentially since their founding in the early thirteenth century, were well established in major universities by mid-century.⁹ The Dominicans in particular were closely associated with learning, and individual members of the Order made

⁵ This ranges from Clement IV in the first recension completed in 1268 to John XXI in the final recension in 1277.

⁶ J. Canning, 'Introduction: Politics, Institutions and Ideas', in J. H. Burns (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Medieval Political Thought c. 350-1450*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1988, p. 343.

⁷ For introductions to the political thought of the thirteenth century, see Canning, *Cambridge History of Medieval Political Thought*, pp. 341-366; A. Black, *Political Thought in Europe: 1250-1450*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1992, pp. 1-13, and, for an older but still influential study, W. Ullmann, *Medieval Political Thought*, Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1975, pp. 159-199. There can, however, be a tendency among historians to oversimplify the connection between imperial decline and new political ideas; for discussion see C. Jones, *Eclipse of Empire? Perceptions of the Empire and its Rulers in Late-Medieval France*, Turnhout, Brepols, 2007, pp. 23-24.

⁸ For overviews of these contributions, see Canning, *Cambridge History of Medieval Political Thought*, pp. 360-361, and Black, *Political Thought in Europe*, pp. 20-24. Black notes, in particular, that 'the inspiration of Thomas Aquinas came from the preaching mission of the Dominican order, which in his case extended to a passionate determination to demonstrate both the reasonableness of Christianity and the divine destiny of the human intellect', pp. 20-21.

⁹ C. H. Lawrence, *The Friars: The Impact of the Early Mendicant Movement on Western Society*, London, Longman, 1994, pp. 127-134. For a discussion of the impact of the mendicant orders' arrival at the universities, see A. Traver, 'The Forging of an Intellectual Defense of Mendicancy in the Medieval University', in D. Prudlo (ed.), *The Origin, Development and Refinement of Medieval Religious Mendicancies*, Leiden, Brill, 2011, pp. 157-195.

considerable intellectual contributions in this period.¹⁰ The influence of Aristotelian scholarship, in turn, is credited as playing a major role in the development of the idea of the nation-state and a movement away from universal claims to authority.¹¹ The intellectual contributions of the Dominican Order, and particularly its most celebrated members, are therefore embedded into the development of political ideas that questioned the role of the emperor. This does not mean, however, that the Order itself encouraged the promulgation of these new political ideas, and nor were they widespread. The *Chronicon* offers an example of an underappreciated thirteenth-century Dominican perspective: a popular and widely-circulated text that clearly presented empire and papacy's dual claims to the rulership of Christendom.

Historiography

This thesis builds upon recent scholarship that challenges dominant ideas in the historiography of two key areas. The study of both the intellectual contributions of the thirteenth-century Dominican Order and the development of political thought in this period have, traditionally, been concerned with the demonstrably progressive ideas of a select group of thirteenth-century theorists, to the exclusion of other medieval perspectives. Factors including the celebrated contributions of Dominican theologians such as Thomas Aquinas to medieval philosophy and political thought, and the Order's popularity among schoolmen, have resulted in the thirteenth-century Order as a whole often being perceived by historians as a group of particularly innovative scholars. The historiography of medieval political thought has, similarly, focused on the idea of the thirteenth century as a 'watershed' moment which marked the emergence of the idea of the nation-state and the decline of the concept of a universal empire. Both these assertions have been challenged by historians in recent decades who have explored a wider range of sources than those traditionally consulted for the intellectual history of the thirteenth century. This thesis builds upon these approaches and makes a new contribution to both areas

¹⁰ Lawrence notes that 'Unlike Francis, Dominic sought from the outset to create a fraternity of educated clerks', and discusses the Dominicans' particular focus on educating their members and recruiting from a pool of distinguished scholars: *The Friars*, pp. 69-88.

¹¹ Canning notes that 'the chief innovation of late medieval political thought was the development of the idea of the secular state as a product of man's political nature', a concept which was 'acquired through the rediscovery of Aristotle's *Politics* and *Ethics*', *Cambridge History of Medieval Political Thought*, p. 360. The extent to which Aristotelian ideas were the main factor in innovative political thought has been questioned, with Black including Aristotelian as one of many key intellectual 'languages' used by theorists in this period, alongside theological, juristic and Ciceronian: *Political Thought in Europe*, pp. 7-10.

of scholarship by considering the underappreciated perspective offered by the *Chronicon*, an influential Dominican text clearly focused on the universal powers of empire and papacy.

M. Michèle Mulchahey addresses the question of Dominican innovation in her extensive study of education in the early Order, stating that the Dominicans ‘are often characterized as having deployed themselves in the vanguard of the new philosophical movements which comprised so much of the intellectual history of the thirteenth century’.¹² In reality ‘the seeds of what came to be a deeply-rooted conservatism in Dominican thought ... were sown as the order took its very first steps towards defining, in essence, the Dominican syllabus’.¹³ Mulchahey’s work remains the most significant and wide-ranging study of the intellectual life of the early Dominicans, but she is not alone in questioning the image of the Dominicans as an order of leading scholars. Jacques Le Goff comments that while the Dominicans are ‘often represented as essentially intellectuals’, they were in fact for the most part ‘simple friars, devoted to preaching and to informing themselves as much as that mission required’.¹⁴ Le Goff concludes that intellectuals ‘were a minority in the Order’, but expands the definition of ‘intellectual’ beyond a narrow group of theologians by including James of Voragine, compiler of the hagiographic collection the *Legenda aurea*, within this group by virtue of ‘his works, his ideas, and his influence’.¹⁵ Le Goff’s study of the *Legenda* offers an example of scholarship that explores complex theological ideas – in Le Goff’s case, the *Legenda*’s construction of ‘sacred time’ – through the work of a Dominican compiler as opposed to more traditional theological sources such as treatises, commentaries, and sermons.¹⁶ Such approaches have opened up the study of the early Dominican Order by considering the range of perspectives represented by the Order’s immense literary output in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.

In-depth scholarship on early Dominican historiographical texts consists, for the most part, of studies like Le Goff’s on the *Legenda*: a focused analysis of one particular text, or one author’s body of work, to examine the ideas and approaches of one particular friar. Other

¹² M. M. Mulchahey, *First the Bow is Bent in Study: Dominican Education Before 1350*, Toronto, Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1998, p. 54.

¹³ Mulchahey, *Dominican Education*, p. 54.

¹⁴ J. Le Goff, *In Search of Sacred Time: Jacobus de Voragine and the Golden Legend*, trans. L. G. Cochrane, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 2014, p. 5.

¹⁵ Le Goff, *In Search of Sacred Time*, p. 6.

¹⁶ For another recent example of scholarship that utilises alternative sources for early Dominican ideas see A. Holloway, ‘Early Dominican Exempla Collections: Defining a Method of Ethical Pedagogy’, unpublished PhD thesis, Monash University, 2015. Similar work is also being carried out by Anna Milne-Tavendale in her doctoral thesis on the early Dominican approach to poverty in the historical and hagiographical material produced by the Order in this period.

examples of this approach, which consider the influence of the Dominican Order on friars' work alongside other factors, include studies on the works of Bernard Gui and the considerable scholarly attention given to Vincent of Beauvais's *Speculum historiale*.¹⁷ Surveys of medieval Dominican historiography often form part of a wider consideration of mendicant historiography, with few dedicated studies of Dominican historiography as a genre.¹⁸ One important recent contribution to this field is Graeme Dunphy's summary of Dominican chronicles in the *Encyclopedia of the Medieval Chronicle*, which catalogues Dominican historiography by century.¹⁹ The Dominicans themselves have also made significant contributions to the study of the early texts of their order: Simon Tugwell has edited a collection of early Dominican writings, and Thomas Kaeppli's *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum Medii Aevi* provides the details and manuscript traditions of medieval Dominican writings.²⁰ The study of the *Chronicon* and its reception within the Order offers further insight into Dominican ideas beyond the insular and isolated milieu of the Order's most renowned intellectuals, in particular with regard to concepts of empire and emperorship.

The seminal work of R. W. and A. J. Carlyle, *A History of Mediaeval Political Theory in the West*, deeply influenced twentieth-century historiography of the medieval empire.²¹ It suggests that 'the civilisation which reached its culmination in the thirteenth century' tended 'not towards unity but rather towards disintegration...to the development of the national system of modern Europe'.²² The Carlyles' assertion that 'while the conception of the political unity of the world under the one authority of the emperor still survived as a theory in some quarters, it had no real significance in the political theory of the thirteenth century',²³ was echoed by

¹⁷ For Bernard Gui see, for example, Lamarrigue, *Bernard Gui*, and A. Dubreil-Arcin, *Vies de saints, légendes de soi: L'écriture hagiographique dominicaine jusqu'au Speculum sanctorale de Bernard Gui († 1331)*, Turnhout, Brepols, 2011; for the *Speculum* see, for example, M. Paulmier-Foucart, S. Lusignan, and A. Nadeau (ed.), *Vincent de Beauvais: Intentions et réceptions d'une œuvre encyclopédique au Moyen-Âge*, Paris, Vrin, 1990; M. Paulmier-Foucart and M. Duchenne, *Vincent de Beauvais et le Grand miroir du monde*, Turnhout, Brepols, 2004; M. Paulmier-Foucart and S. Lusignan, 'Vincent de Beauvais et l'histoire du Speculum Maius', *Journal des savants*, 1990, pp. 97-124.

¹⁸ For an overview of the study of mendicant historiography and an example of this approach, see B. Roest, 'Later Medieval Institutional History', in D. M. Deliyannis (ed.), *Historiography in the Middle Ages*, Leiden, Brill, 2010, pp. 288-315.

¹⁹ G. Dunphy, 'Dominican chronicle tradition', in Dunphy (ed.), *Encyclopedia of the Medieval Chronicle*, vol. 1, pp. 542-545.

²⁰ S. Tugwell O. P. (ed.), *Early Dominicans: Selected Writings*, London, SPCK, 1982; T. Kaeppli O. P. (ed.), *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum Medii Aevi*, 4 vols., Rome, Istituto Storico Domenicano, 1970.

²¹ R. W. Carlyle and A. J. Carlyle, *A History of Mediaeval Political Theory in the West*, vol. 5, 3rd edn., Edinburgh, William Blackwood & Sons, 1950 (first edition published 1928). For a similar study that proved influential in the United States, see C. H. McIlwain, *The Growth of Political Thought in the West: From the Greeks to the End of the Middle Ages*, New York, Macmillan, 1932.

²² Carlyle and Carlyle, *Mediaeval Political Theory*, p. 149.

²³ Carlyle and Carlyle, p. 149.

Walter Ullmann and Robert Folz. Ullmann states that ‘the age of Thomas Aquinas was also the period in which the European importance of the empire visibly shrank’, and is dismissive of thirteenth-century thinkers who continued to support or endorse the role of empire; their works were ‘on the whole retrospective and introspective’ and ‘did not reveal that the new learning had greatly exercised them’.²⁴ His interest is in those thinkers who could be considered as contributing to a progression toward the nation-state; for the others, ‘it cannot be said that these tracts greatly contributed to the development of political thought at the time’.²⁵ Folz, meanwhile, states that by the mid-fourteenth century ‘the concept of empire dissolved completely and what remained was no longer anything but an aspiration’.²⁶ These approaches to the medieval empire are part of a broader trend in historiography identified by John Watts: the preoccupation of historians from the nineteenth century with ‘the birth of the modern state’.²⁷ Watts notes that the political and constitutional history of the nineteenth century ‘centred on the evolution of the nation states that then existed’, and, as a result of this preoccupation, ‘actors, forces and groups that appeared to work against these ends ... [such as] universal empires and churches ... were neglected and depreciated’.²⁸ Modern scholarship on the rise of states, while moving away from the nationalistic tendencies of nineteenth-century historiography, ‘tends to see every other power formation – the universal Church and empire, other churches, towns, principalities, rural communes, leagues and estates – largely in their relation to these emerging Leviathans’.²⁹ In their surveys of the political thought of the thirteenth century, Ullmann and the Carlyles are transparent in their efforts to provide a narrative of progression towards the idea of the nation-state. Folz, while notable for producing a focused study on the concept of the medieval empire in the mid-twentieth century, also frames it in terms of the development of nation-states: he notes in his introduction that ‘from the middle of the ninth century the formation of future European nation-states began to be perceptible...from that moment, with an ever-increasing intensity, the history of the concept of empire was to be that of a divorce between theory and reality’.³⁰

²⁴ Ullmann, *Medieval Political Thought*, p. 186.

²⁵ Ullmann, p. 186. His discussion of ‘the universal state’ and the problem of empire is part of a ‘new orientation’ in this period which ‘can further be exemplified by the development of the concept of the incipient State sovereignty’, p. 195.

²⁶ R. Folz, *The Concept of Empire in Western Europe from the Fifth to the Fourteenth Century*, trans. S. A. Ogilvie, London, Edward Arnold, 1969, pp. xi-xii.

²⁷ J. Watts, *The Making of Politics: Europe 1300-1500*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2009, p. 29.

²⁸ Watts, *Making of Politics*, pp. 29-30.

²⁹ Watts, p. 30.

³⁰ Folz, *Concept of Empire*, p. xi.

The historiography of the thirteenth-century empire has, until recently, been characterised by the treatment – and dismissal – of the universal church and empire as antiquated and irrelevant when discussed alongside the emergence of the state. Peter H. Wilson’s comprehensive and wide-ranging survey of the empire’s history is an example of recent scholarship that treats the medieval empire as a political unit worthy of dedicated study.³¹ In his introduction, Wilson sets his work clearly apart from the historiography of the nation-state, commenting that ‘the Empire’s history is not merely part of numerous distinct national histories, but lies at the heart of the continent’s general development’.³² Wilson’s study fits into a broader historiographical trend in recent decades that explores the medieval empire as an institution – and ideal – in its own right, one that is detached from scholarship concerned predominantly with the development of the nation-state. This shift in focus has allowed for the consultation of a wider range of sources than the ‘traditional’ canon of theoretical texts that were originally employed to support a narrative of national progression. In his 1999 study of the concept of empire, James Muldoon comments that the history of political thought, and in particular medieval political thought, ‘has focused on the writings of philosophers, publicists, and other theorists...as a result, the writings of Thomas Aquinas, for example, on political matters, brief as they are, often receive an excessive amount of attention’.³³ Muldoon’s work instead draws predominantly on the writings of medieval lawyers. Anne A. Latowsky examines emperors in the high and late Middle Ages through the use of the legend of Charlemagne in biography and other historiographical sources.³⁴ Mireille Chazan, Chris Jones, and Georg Jostkleigrewe have utilised chronicles to explore concepts of empire in the context of late-medieval France.³⁵ These approaches give greater attention to perspectives that often reveal an ongoing, developed, and complex concept of imperial rule in the later Middle Ages – far from the outdated and irrelevant viewpoints they are suggested to represent by the likes of Carlyle, Ullmann, and Folz.

In recent decades, the study of both the intellectual contributions of the thirteenth-century Dominican Order and the concept of empire in this period has been augmented by the

³¹ P. H. Wilson, *The Holy Roman Empire: A Thousand Years of Europe’s History*, London, Penguin, 2017.

³² Wilson, *Holy Roman Empire*, p. 1.

³³ J. Muldoon, *Empire and Order: The Concept of Empire, 800-1800*, Basingstoke, Macmillan, 1999, pp. vi-vii.

³⁴ A. A. Latowsky, *Emperor of the World: Charlemagne and the Construction of Imperial Authority*, Ithaca, N.Y., Cornell University Press, 2013.

³⁵ Chazan, *L’Empire*; Jones, *Eclipse of Empire?*; G. Jostkleigrewe, “‘Rex imperator in regno suo’ – An Ideology of Frenchness? Late Medieval France, Its Political Elite and Juridical Discourses”, in A. Pleszczyński, J. Sobiesiak, M. Tomaszek, and P. Tyszka (ed.), *Imagined Communities: Constructing Collective Identities in Medieval Europe*, Leiden, Brill, 2018, pp. 46-82.

use of broader source bases that reflect a more diverse range of perspectives. At the crossroads of these two areas of scholarship, however, the range of perspectives considered by historians remains limited. Scholarship on the political ideas of the Dominican Order, including those dealing with empire, has tended to focus on the work of theologians and theorists such as Thomas Aquinas, John of Paris, and to a lesser extent Ptolemy of Lucca.³⁶ With the exception of Ptolemy, who authored a number of historiographical works alongside his political treatises, these writers represent a decidedly different intellectual context to chroniclers such as Martin. The use of the *Chronicon* in this thesis to explore ideas of empire and emperorship in the later Middle Ages offers a valuable and underexplored Dominican perspective on this topic, and builds upon the approaches discussed above that seek to broaden what has been a traditionally restricted canon of source material.

There is considerable scholarship on the *Chronicon* to date, though detailed analysis of its worldview is limited. Anna-Dorothee von den Brincken has contributed much research on the *Chronicon* focusing on its form and manuscript tradition, and she is working on a new critical edition of the text.³⁷ Its reception by later chroniclers has been studied by Wolfgang Valentin-Ikas, Dan Embree, and William Matthews, whose works have all focused predominantly on the chronicle's use in England.³⁸ In addition to these focused studies, the *Chronicon* has been used as one of a number of sources in scholarship relating to medieval Germany and the Empire, such as Heike Johanna Mierau's work on empire in late-medieval papal-imperial chronicles as a genre, and Len Scales's study on the development of German identity in the later Middle Ages.³⁹ Rolf Sprandel uses the *Chronicon* as a starting point for a

³⁶ For Thomas Aquinas, see, for example, H. Hamilton-Bleakley, 'Thomas Aquinas, Political Thought' in H. Lagerlund (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Medieval Philosophy*, Dordrecht, Springer, 2011, pp. 1287-1290; R. W. Dyson (ed.), *Thomas Aquinas: Political Writings*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2002; for John of Paris: C. Jones (ed.), *John of Paris: Beyond Royal and Papal Power*, Turnhout, Brepols, 2015; for Ptolemy of Lucca, James M. Blythe's two volumes are key: *The Life and Works of Tolomeo Fiadoni (Ptolemy of Lucca)* and *The Worldview and Thought of Tolomeo Fiadoni (Ptolemy of Lucca)*, Turnhout, Brepols, 2009.

³⁷ For the manuscript tradition with a particular focus on the tabular format: A. D. von den Brincken, 'In una pagina ponendo pontifices, in alia pagina imperatores: Das Kopien der tabellarischen Papst-Kaiser-Chronik des Martin von Troppau', *Revue d'histoire des textes*, vol. 18, 1988, pp. 109-136; for an overview of Martin's life and works: von den Brincken, 'Martin von Troppau (Martinus Polonus)', in K. Ruh et al (ed.), *Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters: Verfasserlexikon*, vol. 6, Berlin, Walter de Gruyter, 1987, pp. 158-166.

³⁸ W. Ikas, 'Martinus Polonus' Chronicle of the Popes and Emperors: A Medieval Best-Seller and Its Neglected Influence on Medieval English Chroniclers', *The English Historical Review*, vol. 116, no. 466, 2001, pp. 327-341; D. Embree (ed.), *The Chronicles of Rome: An Edition of the Middle English Chronicle of Popes and Emperors and the Lollard Chronicle*, Woodbridge, Boydell Press, 1999; William Matthews, 'Martinus Polonus and some later Chroniclers', in D.A. Pearsall and R. A. Waldron (ed.), *Medieval Literature and Civilization: Studies in Memory of G. N. Garmonsway*, London, University of London Athlone Press, 1969, pp. 275-288.

³⁹ H. J. Mierau, 'Die Einheit des imperium Romanum in den Papst-Kaiser-Chroniken des Spätmittelalters', *Historische Zeitschrift*, vol. 282, no. 2, 2006, pp. 281-312, and 'Das Reich, Politische Theorien und die Heilsgeschichte: Zur Ausbildung eines Reichsbewußtseins durch die Papst-Kaiser-Chroniken des

discussion on universal history; Jones examines the *Chronicon* alongside Vincent of Beauvais' *Speculum historiale* as sources for the work of John of Paris; and Mulchahey discusses the *Chronicon* alongside Vincent's *Speculum maius* and the *Legenda aurea* as major encyclopedic texts produced by the early Dominican Order.⁴⁰ Both the *Speculum* and the *Legenda* have been the subject of numerous dedicated studies that explore their ideas and worldviews.⁴¹ By focusing on the *Chronicon*, this thesis will make a further contribution to our understanding of thirteenth-century Dominican works of compilation as a genre.

Methodology

This thesis not only examines the *Chronicon* from a new angle that pays particular attention to its status as a Dominican work of compilation, but it also challenges one of the most pervasive and widespread assessments of its value as a text. Scholars have overwhelmingly characterised Martin's chronicle as derivative, inaccurate, and boring. Its modern editor, Ludwig Weiland, refers to the *Chronicon* as 'the work of a most worthless compiler'.⁴² James Westfall Thompson describes it as 'a vast but ill-informed general history', and 'a book without a trace of historical intelligence and full of fables'.⁴³ Denys Hay comments that it 'is poor and arid compared with Vincent [of Beauvais]',⁴⁴ and Herwig Wolfram states that it is a work 'in which critical research and scholarship are singularly lacking'.⁴⁵ More recently Dan Embree, after providing an overview of this scholarly opinion, concludes that 'the negative judgments are entirely deserved, since, even in comparison with other medieval chroniclers, Martinus is distinguished for his failure to provide his readers with either a faithful account of events or a thoughtful interpretation of them'.⁴⁶ These scholars, while noting Martin's popularity and influence on

Spätmittelalters', *Zeitschrift für Historische Forschung*, vol. 32, no. 4, 2005, pp. 543-573; L. Scales, *The Shaping of German Identity: Authority and Crisis, 1245-1414*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2012.

⁴⁰ R. Sprandel, 'World Historiography in the Late Middle Ages', trans. K. E. Thomas, in D. M. Deliyannis (ed.), *Historiography in the Middle Ages*, Leiden, Brill, 2003, pp. 157-179; C. Jones, 'Historical Understanding and the Nature of Temporal Power in the Thought of John of Paris', in Jones (ed.), *John of Paris*, pp. 77-111, and for a revised version of this article see 'Diener zweier Herren? Jean Quidort und das Problem der königlichen Autorität', *Jahrbuch für Universitätsgeschichte*, vol. 19, 2016[18], pp. 153-187; Mulchahey, *Dominican Education*, pp. 465-472.

⁴¹ See n. 17 above for scholarship on the *Speculum*. For the *Legenda* see, in particular, S. Epstein, *The Talents of Jacopo Da Varagine: A Genoese Mind in Medieval Europe*, Ithaca, N.Y., Cornell University Press, 2016, and Le Goff, *In Search of Sacred Time*.

⁴² '...opere compilatoris vilissimi', L. Weiland, 'Introduction to the *Chronicon*', MGH, SS, vol. 22, Hannover, 1872, p. 397.

⁴³ J. W. Thompson, *A History of Historical Writing*, vol. 1, New York, Macmillan, 1942, p. 271 and p. 420.

⁴⁴ D. Hay, *Annalists and Historians*, London, Methuen, 1977, p. 64.

⁴⁵ H. Wolfram, 'Martin of Troppau', in *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. 9, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1967, p. 304.

⁴⁶ D. Embree, 'Introduction', in D. Embree (ed.), *The Chronicles of Rome: An Edition of the Middle English Chronicle of Popes and Emperors and the Lollard Chronicle*, Woodbridge, Boydell Press, 1999, p. 2.

later chroniclers, often suggest that this is the only justification for his receiving scholarly attention. Embree comments, following his scathing assessment, that Martin ‘remains an important medieval writer, however, since the force of his popularity meant that he largely determined what late medieval readers knew, or thought they knew, about their papal and imperial history’.⁴⁷ Von den Brincken has gone some way towards redeeming Martin’s work (indeed, Embree refers to her as Martin’s ‘sole defender’).⁴⁸ She notes that the *Chronicon*’s tabular format and in particular the allocation of lines corresponding to years of reigns was innovative and contributed to the chronicle’s vast popularity.⁴⁹ The approach Martin took to his content, however, has not yet been afforded the same generosity. This thesis reveals distinctive features of Martin’s approach to history and the complexity of his worldview, even in comparison with his closest contemporaries.

The reputation attached to the *Chronicon* in today’s modern scholarship echoes prevalent historiographical attitudes towards chronicles more generally in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Nineteenth-century historians influenced by Leopold von Ranke took an interest in chronicles only for the verifiable facts they contained. They sought to strip away the biases of the chroniclers themselves in search of these facts.⁵⁰ John Burrow notes that this approach to chronicles as recorders of facts, rather than primary sources in their own right, survived among prominent medievalists into the mid-twentieth century,⁵¹ even as early studies on chronicles and chroniclers were beginning to emerge.⁵² The great nineteenth-century volumes of edited medieval texts such as the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* and *Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France*, while an invaluable contribution to the field, were also marked by the editorial decisions of positivist historians regarding the parts of texts that were worth including.⁵³ These editorial decisions pose some challenges for this thesis. Rather than presenting the papal and imperial sections on facing pages as Martin originally intended, the modern MGH edition of the *Chronicon* separates them entirely, with a full papal chronicle preceding the imperial. While von den Brincken’s new edition is intended to address this

⁴⁷ Embree, *Chronicles of Rome*, p. 2. Further examples of this include Thompson, who notes that the *Chronicon* ‘possessed the field and was provided with continuations as necessary’: *History of Historical Writing*, p. 420; and Wolfram’s comment that ‘fables...have survived as a result of this literary work and served as a source for later uncritical historiography’: *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, p. 304.

⁴⁸ Embree, p. 2.

⁴⁹ Von den Brincken, *Encyclopedia of the Medieval Chronicle*, p. 1087.

⁵⁰ J. Lake, ‘Current Approaches to Medieval Historiography’, *History Compass*, vol. 13, no. 3, 2015, p. 89.

⁵¹ J. Burrow, *A History of Histories: Epics, Chronicles, Romances and Inquiries from Herodotus and Thucydides to the Twentieth Century*, London, Allen Lane, 2007, p. 464.

⁵² Lake, *History Compass*, p. 90.

⁵³ For further discussion, including examples of where editorial decisions to exclude content have proven problematic, see Jones, *Eclipse of Empire*, pp. 21-22.

issue,⁵⁴ this is not yet available and the current edition must be used with the caveat that its layout differs fundamentally from Martin's original – in particular, by obscuring the close relationship between papacy and empire.

In the introduction to his edited collection of essays on the twelfth-century chronicler Godfrey of Viterbo, Thomas Foerster summarises a historiographical tradition that is equally applicable to a range of chroniclers, including Martin:

[Godfrey's] approach was universalist and encyclopaedic, he offered very little independent information ... Hence, for positivist historians of the nineteenth century, in search of notoriously elusive 'facts', Godfrey's history was distorted ... whereas his universal history was nothing but an unoriginal collection of encyclopaedic knowledge...In the time after the Second World War, many a medieval writer was rediscovered with new interests...However, [Godfrey's] universalist interest was only studied, if at all, by literary historians, who often looked at his work as a source for others, but rarely as an opus in its own right.⁵⁵

The study of chronicles as texts worthy of scholarly attention in their own right is a newly established field in medieval history. Historians in recent decades have recognised the value of chronicles as sources not merely for facts and chronology, but also for the beliefs and worldviews of their compilers. Bernard Guenée was particularly influential in carving out this field in the 1980s, demonstrating that the act of compilation was one that demanded creativity from the chronicler.⁵⁶ Subsequent scholarship has further explored the process of chronicle compilation, highlighting the influence of chroniclers' thought on the content and structure of their texts. Focusing in particular on universal chronicles, Mireille Chazan has explored the editorial choices made by chroniclers that shaped their texts, including the selection and criticism of sources and the resolution of contradictory material.⁵⁷ Hans-Werner Goetz discusses how the work of chroniclers and annalists reflected contemporary perspectives, being 'deeply rooted in the present' by 'writing for present (and future) generations, by pursuing topical aims and purposes, but also by judging and interpreting the past according to their own

⁵⁴ Von den Brincken, *Encyclopedia of the Medieval Chronicle*, p. 1087.

⁵⁵ T. Foerster, 'Introduction', in T. Foerster (ed.), *Godfrey of Viterbo and His Readers: Imperial Tradition and Universal History in Late Medieval Europe*, Farnham, Ashgate, 2015, pp. 3-4.

⁵⁶ B. Guenée, 'L'historien et la compilation au XIII^e siècle', *Journal des Savants*, 1985, p. 126, cited in C. Jones, 'Geoffroi of Courlon and Political Perceptions in Late Medieval France', *Viator*, vol. 47, no. 1, 2015, p. 156.

⁵⁷ M. Chazan, 'La méthode critique des historiens dans les chroniques universelles médiévales', in M. Chazan and G. Dahan (ed.), *La méthode critique au Moyen Âge*, Turnhout, Brepols, 2006, pp. 223-256.

time'.⁵⁸ Methods such as the selection of facts, the structure of the narrative, and the interpretation of facts and of 'history as a whole' shaped chronicles according to the views of their compilers.⁵⁹ The value of chronicles as mirrors for the perspectives of their compilers is also highlighted by Chris Given-Wilson, who notes that chronicles can 'throw a sharp light on the workings of the medieval mind and the ways in which people in the middle ages conceived of their place in history'.⁶⁰ Meanwhile, Alastair Minnis further emphasises the unique effort of compilation, commenting that 'the labour of compilation is long and heavy, the skill needed for efficient *partium ordinatio* considerable', and drawing attention to Vincent of Beauvais's own understanding of his role as a compiler, noting that 'he is aware...of his distinctive literary role or stance as a compiler'.⁶¹

The understanding of chronicle compilation as a thoughtful and creative act has opened up avenues of historical research that explore the social, political, and religious ideas of the chroniclers themselves, and the ways in which they shaped, and were shaped by, the world around them. Scholarship on medieval chronicles has taken a number of different forms, ranging from comprehensive studies of a particular text or chronicler's ideas, method, and influence,⁶² to the exploration of a particular idea or theme across a range of related chronicles.⁶³ This thesis, while focusing on Martin's *Chronicon*, largely follows the

⁵⁸ H. Goetz, 'The "methodology" of medieval chroniclers', in János M. Bak and Ivan Jurković (ed.), *Chronicon: Medieval Narrative Sources: A Chronological Guide with Introductory Essays*, Turnhout, Brepols, 2013, p. 30.

⁵⁹ Goetz, *Chronicon*, p. 31.

⁶⁰ C. Given-Wilson, *Chronicles: The Writing of History in Medieval England*, London, Hambledon and London, 2004, p. xxiii.

⁶¹ A. Minnis, 'Nolens auctor sed compiler reputari: The Late-Medieval Discourse of Compilation', in Chazan and Dahan (ed.), *La méthode critique*, pp. 59-60.

⁶² Examples of this kind of scholarship are often edited collections focused on one particular chronicler, such as Foerster's collection on Godfrey of Viterbo, and Paulmier-Foucart, Lusignan, and Nadeau's volume on Vincent of Beauvais. An example of a monograph that takes a similar approach to one particular chronicler is Lamarrigue, *Bernard Gui*, which studies the methodology and ideas of Bernard Gui. Recent works on the chronicler and hagiographer James of Voragine by Epstein and Le Goff, discussed in n. 41 above, take a similar approach in comprehensively exploring his ideas, intentions, and context.

⁶³ Scholarship that examines a particular theme across a range of chronicles is extensive. Studies that utilise a particular group of related chronicles include: Chazan, *L'Empire*, on the theme of empire in French universal chronicles from the twelfth to the fourteenth century; D. R. Whaley, 'The Wilted Lily: Representations of the Greater Capetian Dynasty within the Vernacular Tradition of Saint-Denis, 1274-1461', unpublished PhD thesis, University of Canterbury, 2018, permanent link <http://hdl.handle.net/10092/15052>, on the representation of Capetian cadets in continuations to *Les grand chroniques de France*; and E. Rolston, 'The Imperial Character: Alexius I and Ideal Emperor in Twelfth-Century Byzantium', *Parergon*, vol. 35, no. 1, 2018, pp. 17-34, for the concept of emperorship in twelfth-century Byzantine accounts of Alexius I's reign. Studies that explore themes – particularly those relating to empire – across a broader range of chronicle sources include Jones, *Eclipse of Empire?*; Scales, *Shaping of German Identity*; Jostkleigrew, *Imagined Communities*; and A. Sommerlechner, *Stupor Mundi? Kaiser Friedrich II. und die mittelalterliche Geschichtsschreibung*, Vienna, Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1999, which surveys the depiction of Emperor Frederick II across medieval chronicles.

methodology of the latter category by examining the idea of empire presented in the *Chronicon*, and contextualising Martin within a wider body of Dominican chroniclers and compilers.⁶⁴

This thesis will explore the concepts of empire and emperors in the *Chronicon* through its presentation of imperial history and the conduct of individual emperors. Martin compiled the *Chronicon* from a range of at least ten named sources including Livy, Orosius, the *Liber pontificalis*, Godfrey of Viterbo, Gilbert of Rome, and Vincent of Beauvais, though the extent to which he directly engaged with these named sources is varied.⁶⁵ The process of compiling a brief, rigidly-structured chronicle from these lengthy and diverse sources required Martin to select, arrange, and interpret his source material in ways that suited his purpose and reveals his priorities. Key differences between Martin and his sources will therefore be a significant focus in exploring his original ideas. These differences range from the portrayal of events and individuals to the focus and structure of the chronicles themselves.

The *Chronicon* reflects the distinct circumstances and concerns of its compiler. It was intended as a reference work for use in schools and by theologians and canon lawyers.⁶⁶ It was written in Rome while Martin was acting as a papal chaplain and penitentiary at the Curia, and von den Brincken has suggested it may have been commissioned by Clement IV.⁶⁷ A largely ecclesiastical audience was, therefore, a clear consideration for Martin as he approached the compilation, but the influence of his own background is also evident. Born in Opava and educated in Prague, Martin's perspective on empire is one of a friar who lived most of his life in lands subject to imperial influence. His adopted home also left a significant mark on his perspective, with Len Scales noting that 'his viewpoint was a southern, more specifically Roman, one', in comparison to some of his more northern readers.⁶⁸ The extent to which geography, in addition to membership of the Dominican order, influenced Martin's perspectives on empire is a key focus of this thesis. To this end, Martin's ideas will be compared with other Dominican compilers who came from different geographic backgrounds:

⁶⁴ Examples of scholarship that focuses on a particular theme in the work of one chronicler include, for example, E. A. R. Brown, 'Vincent de Beauvais and the *reditus regni francorum ad stirpem Caroli imperatoris*', in Paulmier-Foucart, Lusignan, and Nadeau (ed.), *Vincent de Beauvais*, pp. 167-196, which discusses the concept of a *reditus* to the line of Charlemagne with Louis VIII in Vincent's *Speculum historiale*; C. Jones, 'Geoffroi of Courlon and Political Perceptions in Late Medieval France', *Viator*, vol. 47, no. 1, 2015, pp. 153-190, which explores the relationship of France and the empire in the chronicle of Geoffroi of Courlon; and T. Parker, 'A Woman's Role: How Scribes Depicted Women on the Fifteenth-Century Canterbury Roll', *Comitatus*, vol. 48, 2017, pp. 95-115, which examines the inclusion of women on the Canterbury Roll, a genealogical chronicle.

⁶⁵ Martin of Opava, *Chronicon*, pp. 407-408.

⁶⁶ Von den Brincken, *Medieval Chronicle*, p. 1086.

⁶⁷ Von den Brincken, 1086.

⁶⁸ Scales, *Shaping of German Identity*, p. 285.

his mid-thirteenth century contemporaries, Vincent of Beauvais and James of Voragine, and two early-fourteenth century successors who drew from his work, Bernard Gui and Ptolemy of Lucca. Vincent and Bernard offer French perspectives, while James and Ptolemy represent views from independent Italian republics. This comparison allows for a meaningful exploration of the way each friar's context influenced his treatment of imperial history.

Chapter Structure

This thesis will explore Dominican concepts of empire and emperorship in four chapters, first establishing Martin's own ideas and then situating these within the Dominican historiographical tradition. Chapter 1 will determine Martin's view of the role of the emperor and the expectations of the imperial office by examining the *Chronicon's* presentation of individual emperors. It considers Martin's judgement of imperial character and conduct in four key areas of rulership: legitimacy, military affairs, lawmaking and justice, and piety. From this, a traditional and orthodox vision of emperorship emerges wherein the emperor functions as an essential co-ruler of Christendom, supporting and facilitating the work of the Church. Martin is particularly concerned with questions of piety and orthodoxy, praising those emperors who enabled and upheld orthodox worship and condemning those who led their subjects into heresy or persecuted the faithful.

Chapter 2 builds a more complete picture of Martin's view of empire by examining papal-imperial relations and the way the *Chronicon* presents the balance of power between papacy and empire. Challenging commonly accepted assumptions that Martin subscribes to a 'hierocratic' understanding of papal supremacy over temporal power, it shows that while Martin is more sympathetic to the papacy in cases of papal-imperial conflict and believes in the 'greater dignity' of the papal office, his vision does not support the subordination of empire to papacy. Martin draws from the traditional Gelasian 'two swords' theory, in which two distinct powers, spiritual and temporal, are sufficient for the rule of the Church. The consistency of Martin's view of papal-imperial relations is then explored through a series of case studies: Sylvester and Constantine, who exemplify Martin's vision of ideal cooperation; and excommunicated emperors such as Henry IV and Frederick II, who came into serious conflict with the papacy.

Thus established, Martin's concept of empire is then placed into the context of the mid-thirteenth century Dominican Order in Chapter 3. This chapter will explore the influence of Martin's Dominican education, in particular, as a source for the traditional and orthodox

aspects of his worldview. It will then compare and contrast key aspects of Martin's view of empire with those of his contemporaries, Vincent of Beauvais, in the *Speculum historiale*, and James of Voragine, in the *Legenda aurea*. It demonstrates that while aspects of Martin's worldview can be described as 'Dominican', in that they stem from a Dominican education and in some cases were shared by his brethren, it is also distinct from that of his brothers. Questions of patronage and geographic background influenced each friar's depiction of imperial power and produced variations in their ideas, despite their shared religiosity.

This topic is further explored in Chapter 4, which examines the reception of Martin's *Chronicon* within the Dominican Order through Ptolemy of Lucca's *Annales* and Bernard Gui's *Flores chronicorum*, two early fourteenth-century works which draw considerably on the *Chronicon* as a source. The comparison of the treatment of empire in these works with Martin's reveals a shift in the balance of power between empire and papacy, with both Ptolemy and Bernard prioritising papacy over empire. Beyond this, differences between Martin, Ptolemy, and Bernard in their treatment of imperial history further confirm the importance of geographic background and patronage highlighted in Chapter 3.

This approach allows for a comprehensive examination of the role of empire in Christendom according to Martin's *Chronicon*. It establishes Martin's presentation of imperial history as consistent, deliberate, and carefully considered, the result of a distinct vision of Christian emperorship that informed the approach he took to his material. It considers the context of the Dominican historiographical tradition, exploring the Order's influence on Martin's thought and the ways in which he aligned with and diverged from the ideas of his brethren. From this, a clearer image of Dominican chroniclers' approaches to imperial history emerges, revealing both the level of interaction between Dominican texts and the extent to which this interaction resulted in a shared vision of empire.

Chapter 1: The Role of the Emperor

Martin's compilation of the *Chronicon Pontificum et Imperatorum* reveals much about his view of emperorship and the role of the emperor in Christendom. Through editorial decisions such as the arrangement and structure of his material, the inclusion or exclusion of detail, and the phrasing and tone of his words, Martin creates a chronicle that is distinct from its vast range of source material and reflects the concerns and priorities of its compiler. Martin identifies at least ten sources that he has consulted for the compilation of the *Chronicon*, from Orosius to Vincent of Beauvais, of vastly different genres, lengths, and origins.¹ The creation of a brief but comprehensive papal-imperial chronicle from this plethora of sources required a deliberate and highly selective compilation process, and the resulting content of the *Chronicon* reflects this process. The depiction of certain emperors in positive or negative terms through this careful compilation – just or tyrannical, triumphant or defeated, righteous or wicked – creates a broader picture of Martin's concept of the role of the emperor in European society.

This chapter examines the portrayal of emperors in the *Chronicon*'s imperial section with regard to legitimacy, military affairs, law, and piety, and identifies Martin's primary concern as the emperor's responsibility to the Church. The *Chronicon* uses themes of orthodoxy and papal support to emphasise imperial legitimacy. These range from the large-scale demonisation of Byzantium's iconoclastic emperors to justify the *translatio imperii*, to subtle invalidations of the deposed emperor Frederick II. Martin's approach to military affairs reveals a curious lack of interest in the establishment of peace when compared to his sources, but his interest in the expansion of the empire suggests influence from patristic writings that encouraged the spread of Christianity. While not prioritising the topic of governance, Martin's comments on law and lawgiving emphasise the emperor's role in secular coercion as part of the 'two swords' theory, a concept originating with Pope Gelasius that Christendom was to be governed by a 'spiritual sword' wielded by the pope and a 'material sword' belonging to a temporal ruler.² The issue of piety, however, is Martin's greatest concern. His treatment of heresy and orthodoxy, the iconoclast controversy, crusading, and practical support of the Church reveal the emperor's responsibilities to Christendom that go beyond merely displaying personal piety and orthodoxy. While the spiritual 'sword' in Martin's worldview belongs to the

¹ Martin gives his full list of sources at the end of his introduction: see Martin of Opava, *Chronicon Pontificum et Imperatorum*, ed. L. Weiland, MGH, SS, vol. 22, Hannover, 1872, pp. 407-408.

² For a summary of Gelasius's 'two swords' concept see I. S. Robinson, 'Church and papacy', in Burns (ed.), *Cambridge History of Medieval Political Thought*, pp. 288-289.

pope, the emperor must facilitate both the spread of Christianity and its observance by the people of his empire. The piety, or impiety, of a particular emperor had a profound effect on the Church as a community of believers: pagans can be converted through an emperor's positive influence, or oppressed Christians can be liberated from foreign rule; a heretical emperor, meanwhile, can lead his subjects astray or persecute the faithful.

The Construction of Legitimacy

Throughout the *Chronicon*, Martin's decisions regarding wording and structure act to legitimise certain emperors and invalidate the claims of others. The transfer of the imperial title from the Byzantines to the Carolingians is a remarkable example of Martin's deliberate efforts to legitimise a particular ruler. The magnitude of the *translatio imperii* requires a significant justification, and Martin's selection and arrangement of his source material creates a direct contrast between the iconoclast emperors in Constantinople and the Carolingians. His accounts of the iconoclast emperors Leo III and Constantine V are among his most damning evaluations, and he follows these immediately with a lengthy discussion of Pepin and the Carolingian dynasty. He then includes another four Byzantine emperors before his entry on Charlemagne and subsequent permanent switch to the western emperors.

Before the Carolingians, mentions of Frankish rulers are buried in Martin's divergent accounts of world events taking place during the time of a particular emperor: for example, the pivotal reign of the first Frankish king to convert to Christianity, Clovis, is sandwiched between the death of Saint Brigid and the destruction of Antioch in an earthquake at the end of his entry on Justin I.³ The prominence Martin then grants to Pepin – an entry that runs to thirty-four lines in the modern edition – is striking, not least because he seems to reverse his previous formula and include a mention of the reigning emperor in Constantinople as a sidenote following Pepin's death.⁴ Martin presents the Carolingians as viable alternatives to the heretical iconoclasts in Constantinople, offering a further justification for Charlemagne's coronation. He introduces this diversion matter-of-factly, linking Constantine V and his son Leo's reign with another contemporaneous father-son rule, that of Pepin and his sons, before stating: 'and because the history of Pepin begins here, in order to know who that Pepin was, we will discuss

³ Martin of Opava, *Chronicon*, p. 455.

⁴ 'Hiis temporibus imperator Constantinopolitanus fere solo nomine tantum imperabat...' Martin of Opava, p. 461.

his lineage through succession'.⁵ While Martin is not overly effusive in his praise of the Carolingians, the juxtaposition between their presentation and the vitriol applied to Constantine V immediately beforehand is notable. Among other criticisms, Martin describes the latter as 'corrupted by the incantations of demons'.⁶ By choosing to include Pepin in the chronicle before Charlemagne's imperial coronation, and immediately after the heretical iconoclasts, Martin introduces the Carolingians as potential – and, importantly, more worthy – successors to the Christian empire of the Romans.⁷

The *translatio imperii* from the Byzantines to the Carolingians, while perhaps the most significant transfer of power in the chronicle, is not the only example of Martin going to great lengths to legitimise certain emperors. For the first emperor from the Saxon dynasty, Otto I, Martin repeats the same formula used with the Carolingians by introducing Otto's father, Henry the Fowler, three entries before Otto himself. Henry, like Pepin, is not an emperor; Martin addresses this explicitly, explaining that Henry should not be counted among the emperors because he did not reign in Italy and was not crowned by the Pope.⁸ For Otto himself, Martin includes the comment that he was 'received honourably in Rome by the pope, the clergy, and the people of the city, and crowned as emperor'.⁹ Martin's coverage of imperial coronation is usually restricted to a brief acknowledgement of the papal benediction,¹⁰ and the inclusion of Otto's honourable reception by the clergy and people of Rome carries a further suggestion by the chronicler that his coronation met with widespread popular approval.

Throughout the chronicle, Martin has a tendency to focus more on legitimacy for those rulers who can be seen as signalling major turning points in the empire's history. The additional

⁵ 'Item Constantinus V. cum filio suo Leone et cum Pipino rege Francorum et patricio Romanorum eiusque filiis Karolo et Karolomanno imperavit annis 16. Et quia hic incidit historia Pipini, ut sciatur quis fuerit iste Pipinus, genus per ordinem disseremus', Martin of Opava, *Chronicon*, p. 460.

⁶ 'Nec non infectus demonum incantacionibus', Martin of Opava, *Chronicon*, p. 460.

⁷ Martin's unique framing of the iconoclast controversy as justification for the *translatio imperii* in comparison to other thirteenth-century Dominicans will be discussed in detail in Chapter 3 of this thesis. The concept of a transfer of power due to a deficiency in the incumbent ruler is a common one in medieval thought; for a similar example on medieval approaches to the transfer of Frankish kingship from the Merovingians to the Carolingians due to the inefficacy of Childeric III, see E. Peters, *The Shadow King: Rex Inutilis in Medieval Law and Literature, 751-1327*, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1970, pp. 30-56.

⁸ 'Unde nec ipse inter imperatores computatur, quia non regnavit in Ytalia nec fuit per papam coronatus'. This qualification to be counted among the emperors also appears for Conrad Alemannus two entries previously: 'Tamen inter imperatores non numeratur, quia non imperavit in Ytalia et ideo caruit benedictione imperiale'. The reason for Conrad's inclusion in the chronicle is presumably to account for the passing of the royal crown to Henry and the Saxons: his entry concludes with 'Anno 7. Conradus rex moriens coram principibus regni regem designat Henricum filium Ottonis ducis Saxonum'. Martin of Opava, p. 464.

⁹ '...Romam veniens a papa et clero et a populo Urbis honorifice est receptus et in imperatorem coronatus multa donaria fecit ecclesiis', Martin of Opava, p. 465.

¹⁰ See, for example, Otto III, p. 466; Lotharius IV, pp. 469; Frederick Barbarossa, p. 469; Otto IV, p. 471; and Frederick II, p. 471.

support included for Otto I can be seen earlier for Constantine, the first Christian emperor and the first to rule from Constantinople, ‘who was made emperor and accepted by the citizens, the army, and others’.¹¹ This threefold support makes Constantine’s assumption of the imperial office unique among the late antique emperors in the *Chronicon*, and shows a continuity in Martin’s approach to legitimacy. At the same time, the *Chronicon* includes notable examples of emperors whose claim to the throne were shown to be illegitimate. The most obvious is Augustulus, who is introduced as ‘Augustulus, who presumed to occupy the empire and governed the state for only 15 months’.¹² Phocas, ‘having been made emperor through sedition by the military, killed the noble *augustus* Maurice and many [others]’.¹³ Augustulus is presented as having never legitimately ruled as emperor, while Phocas achieved his elevation through sedition and murder.

Martin is explicit in his requirement that, since the time of Charlemagne, an emperor must receive papal benediction for his claim to the imperial title to be legitimate. His treatment of Frederick II, meanwhile, reveals the complexity of his approach to papal deposition of an emperor. Immediately notable is his use of *regnavit* in the first line of his account of Frederick’s reign instead of *imperavit*, suggesting that he ruled as a king rather than an emperor. Martin uses *imperavit* in the opening line of every other entry in the imperial section other than Augustulus, even for those who, by his own admission, were never made emperor.¹⁴ There is little doubt that this choice of words was deliberate. By using *regnavit* instead of *imperavit*, Martin makes a subtle but pointed effort to invalidate Frederick’s reign as emperor. At the same time, when discussing the vacancy of the imperial office after Frederick, Martin adds an unusual qualification: the vacancy began either after Frederick’s deposition as emperor, or after his death.¹⁵ He comments that the two candidates elected to take Frederick’s place following his deposition died before achieving coronation,¹⁶ but, given the importance Martin places on

¹¹ ‘Qui factus imperator civibus et exercitui et aliis acceptus fuit’, Martin of Opava, p. 450.

¹² ‘Augustulus vero, qui imperium presumserat occupare, et 15 mensibus tantum rem publicam gubernasset’, Martin of Opava, p. 454.

¹³ ‘Iste sedicione militari imperator effectus, Mauricium augustum nobilem et multos interfecit’, Martin of Opava, p. 457.

¹⁴ The most striking example of this is Henry the Fowler, whose exclusion from the imperial office is discussed above; Martin introduces his entry with ‘Henricus rex imperavit annis 18’. Even when explicitly identifying Henry as a king rather than an emperor, Martin still uses *imperavit* for his reign. Martin of Opava, *Chronicon*, p. 464.

¹⁵ ‘Romanum imperium sive post deposicionem Friderici II. ab imperio, sive post mortem eius cepit vacare’, Martin of Opava, p. 472.

¹⁶ ‘Nam post deposicionem ipsius papa Innocencius IV, qui eum deposuerat, procuravit per principes Alamannie electores plures eligi ad imperium, videlicet lantcravium Thuringie et comitem Hollandie successive, qui antequam ad imperialem benedictionem pervenissent, vite terminum exegerunt’, Martin of Opava, p. 472.

the papal benediction for legitimacy, and the fact he does not include either candidate in their own entry, it is clear that neither could be considered to have filled the imperial office. With no viable replacement following Frederick's deposition, this ought to have been the definitive beginning of the imperial vacancy. Martin's comment seems to allow for Frederick's continued reign as emperor after papal deposition until his death. His confusion seems to arise from the fact that there was no viable alternative candidate: he makes no similar comment regarding the deposition of Otto IV, to whom Frederick succeeded.¹⁷ While new candidates were elected in Frederick's place, their failure to obtain coronation meant that Frederick was never actually replaced. The imperial vacancy reveals a grey area regarding the pope's practical ability to terminate the emperor's reign, and Martin appears to be hedging his bets by offering both interpretations. Overall, however, Martin's approach to imperial legitimacy reveals a chronicler with a developed vision of Christian emperorship and the requirements for legitimate and successful rule of Christendom. This vision can be further explored through Martin's treatment of three key aspects of the Christian emperor's role: peace and conquest, law and governance, and piety.

Peace and Conquest

Throughout the chronicle, the emperor's role in establishing peace is understated or often entirely neglected. This is perhaps most clear in Martin's account of Augustus, whose reign has been associated since antiquity with an unprecedented and enduring peace.¹⁸ In the Christian worldview, the peace of Augustus gained greater significance due to the Incarnation of Christ during his reign. Orosius, whose *Historiarum adversum paganos libri VII* was used by Martin as a source for early history, draws the connections between Augustus, Christ, and peace explicitly:

Therefore in that time, that is, the year in which Caesar settled the strongest and truest peace by the ordination of God, Christ was born, upon whose arrival that peace waited, and at whose

¹⁷ Martin's account of Frederick's accession simply notes that he was raised to the imperial throne after the condemnation of Otto: '...et ad imperii fastigium, Ottone dampnato, promotus', Martin of Opava, p. 471.

¹⁸ During Augustus's reign, the *Pax Augusta* was used to refer to the period of peace following civil war, and its worship was established through the construction of the Ara Pacis Augustae, cementing the emperor's association with bringing peace to Rome. P. Kehne, 'Pax Augusta' in H. Canick, H. Schneider and C. F. Salazar (ed.), *Brill's New Pauly: Encyclopaedia of the Ancient World: Antiquity*, vol. 10, Leiden, Brill, 2007, p. 658. Henry Chadwick highlights the importance of the peace of Augustus in early Christian thought through Melito, bishop of Sardis c. 170, who 'regarded it as a special providence that Augustus had established peace in the empire at the time when Christ's gospel of peace was proclaimed', H. Chadwick, 'Christian doctrine', in Burns (ed.), *Cambridge History of Medieval Political Thought*, p. 17.

birth men listened and the angels in exultation sang: ‘Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace to men of good will.’¹⁹

Throughout his discussion of Augustus’s reign, Orosius highlights the importance of peace and the magnitude of Augustus’s achievement. Martin’s selection of Orosius’s material, however, avoids the explicit connections between Augustus and Christ in the context of bringing peace, and downplays the overall importance of peace to Augustus’s rule. Martin lifts part of a line concerning the peace verbatim from Orosius, that ‘from east to west, from north to south, and through the entire circle of the ocean all races [were] gathered in one peace’, but drops the rest of the line about the closure of the gates of Janus, an act symbolic of peace.²⁰ It is worth noting that the section Martin uses from Orosius is an ablative absolute dependent clause, and his changes therefore alter the original meaning of the sentence: while Orosius’s line focuses entirely on peace, Martin treats peace as an afterthought. Instead, he discusses Augustus’s refusal to be worshipped as a god or referred to as *dominus*, emphasising the earthly nature of his rule. For Martin, the importance of Augustus’s reign lies not in the establishment of the *Pax Augusta* but the beginning of a new balance of power between the earthly and the spiritual, coinciding with the birth of Jesus. From this point, he states, ‘two regimes of the city of Rome and the whole world, the pontifical and the imperial, ran together: the pontifical regime through Christ, the imperial through Octavian. These are the two swords, namely the material and the spiritual, which are sufficient for the rule of the church’.²¹ Unlike earlier Christian writers such as Orosius, who presented the concurrent reign of Augustus and the Incarnation of Christ as ushering in a new era of peace, Martin focuses from the outset on rulership and universal authority.

¹⁹ ‘Igitur eo tempore, id est eo anno quo firmissimam verissimamque pacem ordinatione Dei Caesar composuit, natus est Christus, cuius adventui pax ista famulata est, in cuius orto audientibus hominibus exultantes angeli cecinerunt Gloria in excelsis Deo, et in terra pax hominibus bonae voluntatis’, Orosius, *Historiarum adversum paganos libri VII*, ed. K. Zangemeister, Leipzig, Teubner, 1889, p. 231. Martin appears to have accessed Orosius directly rather than through an intermediary source: Vincent of Beauvais does not include material from Orosius for the Augustan age, and Martin’s extensive use of Orosius for early Roman history and the reign of Augustus suggests that he likely had the text in front of him.

²⁰ ‘Anno ab Urbe condita 752. Cesar Augustus ab oriente in occidentem, a septentrione in meridiem, ac per totum oceani circulum cunctis gentibus una pace compositis, cum ipsum pro deo Romani colere vellent, prohibuit, nec dominum se appellari permisit’, Martin of Opava, *Chronicon*, p. 406, cf. ‘Itaque anno ab urbe condita DCCLII Caesar Augustus ab oriente in occidentem, a septentrione in meridiem ac per totum Oceani circulum cunctis gentibus una pace compositis, Iani portas tertio ipse tunc clausit’, Orosius, *Historiarum adversum paganos libri VII*, p. 231.

²¹ ‘Tunc concurrerunt duo regimina Romane urbis et totius orbis, pontificale et imperiale: pontificale regimen per Christum, imperiale per Octavianum. Hii sunt duo gladii, videlicet materialis et spiritualis, qui sufficiunt ad regimen ecclesie’, Martin of Opava, *Chronicon*, p. 406.

Martin's treatment of Augustus is not simply an isolated example, but is indicative of an approach to military affairs throughout the *Chronicon* that prioritises conquest over peace. The inclusion of military affairs such as invasions and conquests is nothing surprising in the *Chronicon*, not least because of Martin's subscription to the 'two swords' theory that casts the emperor in the role of holding the 'material' sword of earthly power. Martin, however, has a particular interest in conquest and notes those emperors who successfully enlarged the empire – the ideal emperor's role is not merely to maintain and defend his current borders, but to extend them. He first comments on this with Augustus, who was hailed as such 'because he enlarged the state'.²² In his introduction, Martin describes Octavian as 'the first emperor and *augustus* of the City and the world'.²³ While the phrasing *imperator et augustus* was likely drawn from the title given to Charlemagne,²⁴ Martin is aware of the specific implication of *augustus* as one who enlarges the state,²⁵ linking this title with the imperial office from the outset. In his account of Trajan's reign, Martin states that he, after Augustus, 'extended the boundaries of the Roman empire far and wide'.²⁶ Theodosius is called an 'enlarger of the state',²⁷ and Justinian II 'greatly increased the Roman empire'.²⁸ Conversely, in one of the most scathing entries outside of the iconoclast emperors, Martin states that Nero 'disfigured and diminished the Roman empire'.²⁹ In the time of Nicephorus, the penultimate eastern emperor to be included in the *Chronicon*, 'the eastern empire came to almost nothing'.³⁰ The majority of these comments correspond to a broader positive (in the case of Augustus, Trajan, Theodosius, and Justinian II) or negative (in the case of Nero) presentation of the emperors concerned. Nicephorus, whose entry is brief and otherwise neutral, is the exception; however,

²² '...tunc primum Augustus eo, quod rem publicam auxerit, a Romanis est salutatus', Martin of Opava, p. 444.

²³ 'imperiale vero regimen incepit ab Octaviano, qui primus imperator et augustus Urbis et orbis', Martin of Opava, p. 406.

²⁴ The title 'imperator et augustus' being applied to Charlemagne is attested in the *Annales Regni Francorum*: 'et post laudes ab apostolico more antiquorum principum adoratus est atque ablato patricii nomine imperator et augustus est appellatus', *Annales Regni Francorum*, ed. F. Kurze, MGH, SS rer. Germ., vol. 6, Hannover, 1895, p. 113.

²⁵ The *Gesta Philippi Augusti* of Rigord gives a similar explanation of the meaning of the title *Augustus* in an attempt to justify the application of the epithet to Philip II in the early thirteenth century: '...unde iste merito dictus est Augustus ab aucta re publica', Rigord, *Gesta Philippi Augusti*, ed. É. Carpentier, G. Pon and Y. Chauvin, Paris, CNRS Éditions, 2006, p. 118. While *Augustus* was often used as simply part of the imperial title, Rigord's usage demonstrates that there was a wider awareness of the term's particular meaning in this period, even if it did not catch on for Philip himself: see C. Jones, 'Undefined Terms: Empires and Emperors in Late Medieval French Thought', *The Medieval History Journal*, vol. 20, no. 2, 2017, pp. 334-335. Martin takes the explanation for the title 'Augustus' from Paul the Deacon's *Historia Romana*, as noted by Weiland, *Chronicon*, p. 444.

²⁶ 'Hic post Augustum fines Romani imperii longe lateque ampliavit', Martin of Opava, p. 446.

²⁷ 'Fuit autem Theodosius propagator rei publice', Martin of Opava, p. 453.

²⁸ 'Hic bonus, prudens et largus, et Romanum imperium auxit nimis', Martin of Opava, p. 459.

²⁹ 'Hic Romanum imperium deformavit et minuit', Martin of Opava, p. 444.

³⁰ 'Quibus temporibus imperium orientale quasi ad nichilum devenerat', Martin of Opava, p. 461.

Martin's decision to include this detail about the diminishing eastern empire almost immediately before Charlemagne's entry acts to further justify the *translatio imperii* from east to west. This interest in the expansion of the empire aligns with influential Gregorian and Augustinian ideas on the military role of the emperor. Pope Gregory I justified war 'for the sake of enlarging the *res publica* within which we see God worshipped...so that the name of Christ will travel among the subject peoples through the preaching of the faith'.³¹ Augustine of Hippo states that Christian emperors are happy if they, among other things, 'make their power the handmaid of His majesty by using it to spread His worship to the greatest possible extent'.³² Martin does not explicitly justify the expansion of the empire in these terms, but it is likely he was influenced by patristic ideas that promoted imperial expansion for the sake of spreading Christianity. This, combined with Martin's explicit mention of the two swords doctrine, suggests that the view of emperorship in the *Chronicon* is built on a strong foundation of traditional theology.

Justice and Law

Practical issues of governance and justice, particularly lawmaking, receive brief but frequent coverage in the *Chronicon*. These align with Martin's subscription to the 'two swords' theory. While he does not prioritise the concept of emperor as lawgiver, Martin points out those emperors notable for making laws, beginning with Hadrian, who was 'glorious in all things and composed many laws'.³³ His discussion of Justinian includes the comment that he 'composed laws and compiled the books [known as] the Codex and Digest', and 'abbreviated the laws of the Romans'.³⁴ In addition to these brief mentions, Martin discusses the laws of Valens, Zeno, and Conrad I. Valens, providing an example of the danger of laws passed by an impious emperor, 'gave a law that monks should serve in the army, and had those who refused killed with clubs'; and Zeno and Conrad I simply 'made many laws'.³⁵ Among these, Conrad, 'wishing to conserve peace in the land, decreed that anyone who broke the emperor's peace

³¹ Gregory I, *Registrum* 1.73, cited in Robinson, *Cambridge History of Medieval Political Thought*, p. 293.

³² Augustine of Hippo, *The City of God Against the Pagans*, trans. R. W. Dyson, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1998, Book V, ch. 26, p. 232.

³³ 'Iste fuit in omnibus gloriosus, leges multas condidit', Martin of Opava, p. 446.

³⁴ 'Hic leges condidit et consummavit libros scilicet Codicem et Digestum', Martin of Opava, p. 455; 'Hic Iustinianus abbreviavit leges Romanorum', p. 456. Martin again mentions matters of law as a priority during the reign of Justinian, though he also indicates that the prosperity of the empire was due to the general Belisarius: 'Huius Iustiniani temporibus res publica est multum prosperata tam in Orientale quam in Occidente. Nam licet ipse esset circa libros et leges intentus, per patricium tamen Belisarium nomine, quem ad bella constituit, prospere ubique gessit', p. 456.

³⁵ 'Hic legem dederat, ut monachi militarent; nolentes vero fustibus fecit interfici', Martin of Opava, p. 453; 'Hic fecit leges plurimas', p. 455; 'Hic multas leges condidit', p. 466.

would be beheaded'.³⁶ The laws Martin chooses to individually comment on emphasise the 'material sword' nature of the emperor's role. As I. S. Robinson summarises, this sword signified 'in patristic writings...as in the Vulgate or in Roman Law, the coercive and punitive power of the State'.³⁷ As the 'classic interpretation' of the two swords theory developed to include the 'spiritual sword of excommunication' wielded by the pope, the material sword maintained its role in secular coercion.³⁸ In the laws of both Valens and Conrad, the punishment for transgressors is death; the emperor enforces his authority through the material sword. The difference between these laws, meanwhile, highlights the importance of an emperor's piety and respect for the Church, given his authority over life and death. The maintenance of peace is a just cause for the use of the emperor's sword; forcing monks into battle is clearly not.

Martin's inclusion of the laws given by particular emperors demonstrates that he believes it to be a significant aspect of the emperor's role in wielding the material sword, but it is not a priority for him: his coverage, while acknowledging noteworthy laws, is cursory at best. The emperor's role as lawgiver is not of any particular importance in the *Chronicon*, standing in stark contrast to developments in twelfth-century imperial ideology, particularly at the court of Frederick Barbarossa, that emphasised the legal aspects of emperorship.³⁹ This particular interest in the emperor's legal authority was closely linked to imperialist rhetoric.⁴⁰ Jean Dunbabin notes that Godfrey of Viterbo discussed and provided evidence for the ideology of empire at Barbarossa's court, which included the idea that the empire 'was characterized by its careful administration of law, including Roman law'.⁴¹ Godfrey is one of the sources Martin lists for the *Chronicon*, though Ludwig Weiland notes that much of the material from Godfrey's *Pantheon* that appears in the *Chronicon* was likely to have been copied from Gilbert of Rome rather than directly from Godfrey.⁴² Whether Martin accessed Godfrey directly or via Gilbert,

³⁶ 'Hic pacem in terris conservare cupiens statuit, ut quicumque principum pacem infringeret, capite plecteretur', Martin of Opava, p. 466.

³⁷ Robinson, *Cambridge History of Medieval Political Thought*, p. 302.

³⁸ Robinson, p. 303.

³⁹ For a discussion of ideas of emperorship put forward by jurists attached to Barbarossa's court, see K. Pennington, *The Prince and the Law, 1200-1600: Sovereignty and Rights in the Western Legal Tradition*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1993, pp. 9-30; for the development of legal arguments concerning the emperor's power, particularly under Barbarossa, see R. L. Benson, 'Political *Renovatio*: Two Models from Roman Antiquity', in R. L. Benson and G. Constable (ed.), *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century*, Cambridge, M. A., Harvard University Press, 1982, pp. 360-379.

⁴⁰ Benson, *Renaissance and Renewal*, p. 360, and Pennington, *The Prince and the Law*, p. 11.

⁴¹ J. Dunbabin, 'The Distinctive Elements Among Godfrey of Viterbo's Political Ideas', in Foerster (ed.), *Godfrey of Viterbo*, p. 39.

⁴² See, for example, note 74 in the *Chronicon*, p. 466. For an introduction to Gilbert of Rome see C. Bratu, 'Gilbertus Romanus', in G. Dunphy (ed.), *Encyclopedia of the Medieval Chronicle*, vol. 1, Leiden, Brill, 2010, p. 706.

this offers an example of twelfth-century imperial ideas about the importance of law not being carried over into more papally-oriented chronicles in the thirteenth century.⁴³

Imperial Piety

Though the *Chronicon* includes detail on aspects of legitimacy, military expansion, and governance, Martin's primary concern regarding the deeds of individual emperors is that of piety. While the pope holds the spiritual 'sword', the emperor's role as the temporal ruler of Christendom nevertheless demands that he promote orthodoxy, suppress heresy, support public devotion, and, when necessary, go on crusade. Emperors who do these things are held up as exemplary, and the positive effects of their actions for Christendom as a whole are detailed. The most damning invectives against rulers in the *Chronicon*, meanwhile, are reserved for those emperors who act impiously, and most importantly, who cause their subjects to do the same.

Heresy and Orthodoxy

Throughout the *Chronicon*, Martin reveals himself to be deeply preoccupied with questions of heresy and orthodoxy. He first raises the issue of heresy in the reign of Probus, well before the Christianising of the empire under Constantine, by commenting on the rise of 'the heretic Mani'.⁴⁴ The Arian heresy arose during the reign of Constantine, who gathered the Council of Nicaea 'for the purpose of condemning the heresy'.⁴⁵ Constantine himself, according to Martin, was baptised by Pope Sylvester 'for the reason of cleansing him of leprosy',⁴⁶ but, notably, 'certain people have reported that Constantine, at the end of his life, was rebaptised by the bishop Eusebius of Nicomedia and converted to the Arian doctrine'.⁴⁷ Martin dismisses this last point as false, having been disproved by other authorities,⁴⁸ but both the inclusion and the refutation of the possibility of Constantine holding heretical beliefs is telling. Constantine is a significant figure in the history of Christianity, and the *Chronicon* must emphasise both his role in suppressing heresy and the orthodoxy of his personal beliefs. In this

⁴³ Gilbert's papal sympathies will be discussed in Chapter 2 of this thesis.

⁴⁴ Martin of Opava, p. 449.

⁴⁵ 'Necenumque concilium a Constantino ad condemnandum heresim congregatur 318 episcoporum', Martin of Opava, p. 450.

⁴⁶ 'Iste devictis Maxencio et Licinio et Severo imperatoribus a Silvestro papa causa mundandi a lepra baptizatus est', Martin of Opava, p. 450.

⁴⁷ 'Constantinum autem in extremo vite sue ab Eusebio Nichomediensi episcopo rebaptizatum et in Arrianum dogma conversum esse quidam retulerunt,' Martin of Opava, p. 450.

⁴⁸ 'Sed hoc de Constantino mendose dicitur, quia beatus Gregorius in Registro cum loquitur Mauricio, eum bone memorie appellat, et in Historia Tripartita eius exitus atque acta bona inveniuntur', Martin of Opava, p. 450.

account Martin differs considerably from Vincent of Beauvais, his likely source: Vincent includes the story of the emperor's Arian baptism, citing Jerome, and while he comments that other sources make no mention of it, he does not dismiss it outright as false.⁴⁹ Martin is not only at pains to prove the story wrong, he also notably obscures its source by referring to 'certain people', rather than attributing it to the respected authority of Jerome.

From Constantine onward, Martin praises those emperors who conform to orthodox Christianity and criticises those who fall into heresy. After becoming emperor, Constantine's son Constantius II 'became an Arian and persecuted Christians the whole world over', and similarly Valens, 'wishing to persecute Christians because he was an Arian', was restrained by the length of time he lived.⁵⁰ Anastasius 'did not keep the laws of the churches, but, favouring heretics, persecuted the Catholics'.⁵¹ Constantine III, 'deceived by Paul of Constantinople, set forth an edict (*typus*) against the Catholic faith' and 'condemned many of the orthodox [faith] to flogging and exile, because they refused to acquiesce to his heresy'.⁵² These emperors do not merely hold heretical beliefs, but impose them on their subjects and actively persecute orthodox Christians. Similarly, those emperors explicitly identified as orthodox Christians are shown acting for the betterment of the church. Theodosius I, a 'most Christian emperor', inspired devotion from barbarians for his perfect virtue; through his influence, 'many races, having abandoned their errors and idols, were converted to Christ'.⁵³ Justin, another 'most Christian emperor', decreed that 'churches of the heretics everywhere should be consecrated in the Catholic religion'.⁵⁴ Liberius – probably Tiberius II – 'most Christian and most righteous towards the poor, gave the treasures of the palace to the poor'.⁵⁵ Although the epithet

⁴⁹ Vincent of Beauvais, *Speculum historiale*, Benedictines of Saint-Vaast d'Arras (ed.), *Bibliotheca mundi, seu venerabilis viri Vincentii Burgundi ex ordine Praedicatorum, episcopi Bellovacensis, Speculum quadruplex, naturale, doctrinale, morale, historiale*, vol. 4, Douai, B. Belleri, 1624, book 13, ch. 102, p. 540.

⁵⁰ 'Et demum imperio assumpto Constantius Arrianus effectus est et christianos toto orbe persequitur'; 'Hic fratrem suum Valentem...volentem persequi christianos, eo quod Arrianus esset, tempore quo vixit conpescuit', Martin of Opava, p. 452.

⁵¹ '...quia nec iura servavit ecclesiarum, sed hereticis favens, catholicos est persecutus', Martin of Opava, p. 455.

⁵² 'Hic Constantinus a Paulo Constantinopolitano deceptus exposuit typum contra fidem catholicam'; 'Hic Constantinus imperator multos orthodoxorum verberibus et exiliis condempnavit, eo quod heresi sue acquiescere nollent', Martin of Opava, p. 458.

⁵³ 'Iste christianissimus imperator fuit...Hic propter virtutem perfectionem etiam a barbaris summe diligebatur. Unde multe gentes ad ipsius inductum, relictis erroribus et ydolis, ad Christum converse sunt', Martin of Opava, p. 453.

⁵⁴ 'Hic Iustinus christianissimus imperator statuit, ut ubique ecclesie hereticorum catholica religione consecrarentur', Martin of Opava, p. 455.

⁵⁵ 'Hic christianissimus et in pauperes piissimus thesauros palatii pauperibus erogabat', Martin of Opava, p. 457.

‘christianissimus’ developed as a formulaic title from late antiquity,⁵⁶ Martin employs the title sparingly for those rulers whose conduct clearly justifies its use.⁵⁷ Constantine IV, described as ‘orthodox *augustus*’, restored the churches destroyed by heretics in the time of Heraclius.⁵⁸ With the exception of ‘Liberius’, whose faith manifested in charity towards the poor, these emperors were instrumental in acts of conversion to and restoration of orthodoxy.

Iconoclasm in eighth-century Byzantium is treated by Martin as the height of heresy. The iconoclast controversy over the use of holy images arose in the Eastern empire in the early eighth century. It became a political as well as a theological issue with Emperor Leo III’s support for iconoclasm from 726.⁵⁹ Martin describes the Emperor Philip as a heretic who ‘ordered all the church pictures to be removed’, thereby establishing the link between iconoclasm and heresy.⁶⁰ Leo III, in turn, was ‘led astray by a certain forsaker of the faith, declared war against images of God and the saints, and ordered them everywhere to be pulled down and burned’.⁶¹ Leo’s iconoclasm caused turmoil in Constantinople and martyrdom among the faithful.⁶² Having ‘died in treachery’, he was succeeded by his son Constantine V.⁶³ Constantine is the object of the worst invective directed at any emperor in the *Chronicon*: he is described as ‘the successor to the impiety of his fathers, the persecutor of the laws handed down from his fathers, for the whole time of his life in the service of evil and magic’.⁶⁴ Through him, ‘many clerics, laymen, and monks in the faith were endangered’.⁶⁵ In ordering the destruction of the images at a synod in Constantinople, Constantine ‘caused the church of God

⁵⁶ On the early development of the title in late antiquity and the Byzantine empire, see H. Bellen, *Politik – Recht – Gesellschaft: Studien zur Alten Geschichte*, Stuttgart, Steiner, 1997, pp. 151-166, and H. Tamas, ‘Valentinian I, *christianissimus imperator*? Notes on a passage of the *Passio Pollionis* (BHL 6869)’, *Vigiliae Christianiae*, vol. 68, 2014, pp. 82-97. For the use of *christianissimus* in the later Middle Ages and its adoption as an exclusively French royal title, see J. Krynen, ‘“Rex Christianissimus”: A medieval theme at the roots of French absolutism’, *History and Anthropology*, vol. 4, no. 1, 1989, pp. 79-96.

⁵⁷ Martin also uses ‘rex christianissimus’ to refer to Clovis (*Chronicon* p. 456) and Louis IX (p. 474.)

⁵⁸ ‘Mortuo autem apud Constantinopolim orthodoxo augusto’, Martin of Opava p. 459; ‘restauravit etiam ecclesias, que per hereticos dirute fuerant, a temporibus Eraclii proavi sui’, p. 458.

⁵⁹ A. Karahan, ‘Byzantine Iconoclasm: Ideology and Quest for Power’, in K. Kolrud and M. Prusac (ed.), *Iconoclasm from Antiquity to Modernity*, Farnham, Ashgate, 2014, p. 85. For the interaction between Byzantium and the Carolingians during the iconoclast period, see T. F. X. Noble, *Images, Iconoclasm, and the Carolingians*, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009.

⁶⁰ ‘Hic cum esset hereticus, omnes picturas ecclesiasticas precepit auferri’, Martin of Opava, p. 459.

⁶¹ ‘Hic Leo imperator a quodam refuga fidei seductus, contra ymagines Dei et sanctorum bellum indicit easque ubique deponi et incendi iubet’, Martin of Opava, p. 460.

⁶² ‘Constantinopolitani quoque pro desposicione ymaginum contra ipsum tumultuantur, aliqui etiam pro hoc martirizantur’, Martin of Opava, p. 460.

⁶³ ‘Hoc Leone in perfidia mortuo successit filius Constantinus’, Martin of Opava, p. 460.

⁶⁴ ‘Hic impietatum patrum successor legumque a patribus traditarum persecutor omni tempore vite sue maleficiis et magicis deserviens’, Martin of Opava, p. 460.

⁶⁵ ‘et multi clerici et laici et monachi per ipsum in fide periclitati sunt’, Martin of Opava, p. 460.

to stumble most gravely'.⁶⁶ Martin concludes by comparing Constantine to Diocletian: 'thus with his sacrilegious sacrifices and killing of the monks he persecuted the church of God, so that he seemed to transcend even the madness of Diocletian, formerly the persecutor of the church'.⁶⁷ Given Diocletian's reputation as the greatest persecutor of the early Church, the magnitude of Martin's condemnation is clear.⁶⁸ The common themes of heretical emperors are exaggerated in Constantine. While others were themselves corrupted by heretics, Constantine is directly in the service of evil. The persecution that earns a throwaway comment in the accounts of other emperors is the focus for Martin's assessment of Constantine. According to the *Chronicon*, the iconoclast emperors are responsible for a widespread heretical movement in the eastern Church, corrupting their subjects and persecuting those who kept the orthodox faith. Iconoclasm is a direct and unforgivable violation of the responsibility of the Christian emperor to promote orthodoxy and suppress heresy among his subjects. Iconoclasm remained an imperial policy until the veneration of images was restored under Empress Irene in 787; the controversy emerged again in the early ninth century,⁶⁹ but Martin pays no further attention to the east following the *translatio imperii* to the Carolingians.

Crusading

The crusades offer another avenue for the expression of imperial piety. The role of crusading in the *Chronicon*'s depiction of imperial piety is seen more in proto-crusader figures, early emperors such as Heraclius and Charlemagne who were credited with crusade-like missions in later legend, than in the Hohenstaufen emperors, Frederick Barbarossa and Frederick II, who actually took the cross and went on crusade.⁷⁰ Barbarossa's role in the Third Crusade is minimised: having taken the cross in order to make amends to the pope, the emperor,

⁶⁶ 'Iste Constantinus, convocata Constantinopoli synodo, precipiens deposicionem ymaginum ecclesiam Dei gravissime scandalizat', Martin of Opava, p. 460.

⁶⁷ 'sacrificiis sacrilegis ac monachorum perempcionibus sic ecclesiam Dei persequitur, quod etiam venasiam Diocleciani persecutoris quondam ecclesie transcendere videbatur', Martin of Opava, p. 460.

⁶⁸ The 'Great Persecution' of Diocletian was recorded by Eusebius of Caesarea, who lived through the reigns of Diocletian and Constantine and whose works were popularised in the west by Jerome: see, for example D. Potter, *Constantine the Emperor*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2012, pp. 301-303, and F. Winkelmann, 'Historiography in the Age of Constantine', in G. Marasco (ed.), *Greek and Roman Historiography in Late Antiquity: Fourth to Sixth Century A.D.*, Leiden, Brill, 2003, pp. 3-41. For Eusebius's influence on universal historiography in the Middle Ages, see M. I. Allen, 'Universal History 300-1000', in D. M. Deliyannis (ed.), *Historiography in the Middle Ages*, Leiden, Brill, 2003, pp. 20-24. Martin himself echoes Orosius's comment that the persecution under Diocletian 'was almost more harsh than all the others before it' ('que persecucio fere omnibus anterioribus durior erat'), *Chronicon*, p. 450, cf. Orosius, *Historiarum adversum paganos libri VII*, p. 265.

⁶⁹ Karahan, *Iconoclasm*, p. 79.

⁷⁰ Conrad III and his involvement in the Second Crusade are featured in the *Chronicon*, though Martin refers to him as *Conradus rex* throughout and concludes with the fact that he never received imperial benediction: '*benedictionem tamen imperialem non habuit*', p. 469. His role in the crusade is as a king, not an emperor.

‘proceeding with a great multitude by land, not by sea, for the liberation of the Holy Land, was drowned in a little river when he was in Armenia’.⁷¹ Here, Martin differs from a number of other chroniclers who took a laudatory view of Barbarossa’s crusading efforts.⁷² For Frederick II’s crusade and capture of Jerusalem, Martin is pejorative as well as dismissive: ‘this emperor, having formerly taken the sign of the cross, crossed the sea under an existing sentence of excommunication, leaving behind greater desolation than consolation for the Holy Land’.⁷³ By contrast, the ‘crusading’ acts of Heraclius and Charlemagne are celebrated as triumphant and pious. The representation of both these emperors as ‘crusaders’ has been well recognised by modern historians, with Heraclius’s recovery of the True Cross and Charlemagne’s legendary visit to the east taking on a crusading theme across a range of sources in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.⁷⁴ Martin himself draws from two different sources for Heraclius’s ‘crusade’: he takes a straightforward account of the emperor’s defeat of the Persians from Gilbert of Rome’s *Chronicon*, but then expands on it to include the miraculous elements of the emperor’s entry into Jerusalem which he found in the *Speculum historiale*:

This Heraclius, having defeated the Persians, returning with great glory, restored the patriarch Zachary and the whole captured Christian population of Jerusalem, and, carrying the sacred cross which he had recovered from Chosroes [and] adorned in a royal style, when he wished to enter through the gate through which Christ had exited bearing the cross to his Passion, the

⁷¹ ‘...pro emenda assumpto crucis caractere, per terram non per mare cum magna multitudine ad liberacionem Terre Sancte procedens, cum esset in Armenia, in parvo flumine submergitur’, Martin of Opava, p. 470.

⁷² For examples of French chroniclers in particular who viewed Barbarossa’s crusade in a positive light, see Jones, *Eclipse of Empire*, pp. 344-345.

⁷³ ‘Hic imperator cruce dudum signatus durante sententia excommunicacionis mare transivit, maiorem desolacionem Terre Sancte quam consolacionem relinquens’, Martin of Opava, p. 471.

⁷⁴ Scholarship on the depiction of these emperors as crusading figures includes, for Heraclius: G. Q. de Souza, ‘Heraclius, emperor of Byzantium’, *Revista Digital de Iconografia Medieval*, vol. 7, no. 14, 2015, pp. 27-38, a study of iconography of Heraclius in Western Europe from the eleventh to thirteenth centuries, and G. Regan, *First Crusader: Byzantium’s Holy Wars*, Gloucestershire, Sutton Publishing, 2001, p. 77, for a discussion of Western representations of Heraclius as crusader; for Charlemagne: Latowsky, *Emperor of the World*, which explores the significance of Charlemagne’s legendary journey to the East; for a discussion of the role of Charlemagne legends as a factor for participation in the First Crusade, see M. Gabriele, *An Empire of Memory: The Legend of Charlemagne, the Franks, and Jerusalem before the First Crusade*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2011; J. Stuckey, ‘Charlemagne as Crusader?: Memory, Propaganda, and the Many Uses of Charlemagne’s Legendary Expedition to Spain’, in M. Gabriele and J. Stuckey, (ed.), *The Legend of Charlemagne in the Middle Ages: Power, Faith, and Crusade*, New York, Palgrave, 2008, pp. 137-152, discusses the development of the legend of Charlemagne into one of crusade; Jones, *Eclipse of Empire*, pp. 347-349, discusses the significance in French thought of Charlemagne’s ‘crusade’ taking place after his imperial coronation; E. A. R. Brown and M. W. Cothren, ‘The Twelfth-Century Crusading Window of the Abbey of Saint-Denis: Praeteritorum Enim Recordatio Futurorum est Exhibitio’, *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, vol. 49, 1986, pp. 14-15, discusses the depiction of Charlemagne as a crusading figure in stained glass.

gates were closed by divine means, and opened again for him to enter after he humbled himself.⁷⁵

This passage is a highly condensed version of the miracle as it appears in the *Speculum*, which Vincent of Beauvais cites from the *Historia de exaltatione Sancte Crucis*. Guilherme Queiroz de Souza links the rising popularity of the Heraclius myth in Western Europe, propagated by the *Reversio Sanctae Crucis*, with the ‘consolidation of an intensely apocalyptic-eschatological movement: the Crusades’.⁷⁶ Similarly, Geoffrey Regan describes Heraclius as the ‘first crusader’ in medieval thought: ‘none of the paladins of chivalry contributed quite so much to the movement as Heraclius: he reconquered the Holy Land and returned the True Cross of Jesus to Jerusalem’.⁷⁷ Heraclius was already a figure associated with the crusades by the late-thirteenth century, and Martin’s inclusion of his miraculous entry into Jerusalem further emphasised his piety and divine favour. For Charlemagne, Martin provides an account of the emperor’s mythical journey to Jerusalem and Constantinople:

This emperor, having received legates from the patriarch of Jerusalem and Constantine emperor of Constantinople, and learning that the Holy Land was occupied by Saracens, sympathising with the Holy Land, came to that place with a great army and regained the land. When he returned through Constantinople, he refused to accept the gold, silver and precious gems presented to him by the emperor Constantine, but asked only for relics of Christ and the saints...⁷⁸

By the thirteenth century, associations between Charlemagne and the crusades were well established.⁷⁹ This story of Charlemagne liberating the Holy Land and being offered relics by the Byzantine emperor has its origins in the late eleventh-century *Descriptio qualiter Karolus*

⁷⁵ ‘Hic Eraclius devicta Perside cum gloria rediens, Zachariam patriarcham et omnem populum christianum captivum Iherosolimam reduxit et sanctam crucem, quam a Cosdroe receperat, portans, ornatus regio scemate, dum per portam per quam Christus baiulans crucem ad passionem exivit vellet intrare, porta divinitus clauditur, eique humiliato rursum ad intrandum aperitur’, Martin of Opava, p. 457. For Gilbert of Rome’s discussion of Heraclius, see *Chronicon*, p. 128, and for Vincent, see *Speculum historiale*, book 23, ch. 12, pp. 903-904. Martin certainly employed both these sources: Gilbert, writing in 1220, predated Vincent, and there is no evidence that Vincent included any material of Gilbert’s in the *Speculum historiale*.

⁷⁶ de Souza, *Iconografia Medieval*, p. 28.

⁷⁷ Regan, *First Crusader*, p. 77.

⁷⁸ ‘Hic etiam percipiens Terram Sanctam occupatam a Sarracenis, legatis patriarche Ierosolimitani et Constantini imperatoris Constantinopolitani receptis, Terre Sancte compaciens cum magno exercitu illuc usque pervenit et recuperata terra, cum per Constantinopolim rediret, auro argentoque et gemmis preciosis a Constantino imperatore exhibitis, cum nollet recipere, solas Christi et sanctorum reliquias postulavit’, Martin of Opava, p. 461.

⁷⁹ Scholars identify the transformation of Charlemagne into a crusading figure as occurring predominantly in the twelfth century following the First Crusade, eg. Brown and Cothren, *Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, p. 15, and Stuckey, *Legend of Charlemagne*, p. 137.

Magnus,⁸⁰ and presumably came to Martin's attention through its inclusion in Vincent of Beauvais.⁸¹ Martin does not use any part of Vincent's account verbatim, but there seems little doubt that it was his source for the story. Like Heraclius, Charlemagne recovers the Holy Land, liberating it from captivity, and displays an act of pious humility when he is received in triumph. In these apocryphal stories, both emperors are models of a crusading ideal that offers a stark contrast to the Hohenstaufen who actually took the cross. Barbarossa, far from achieving the triumphant military successes of Heraclius and Charlemagne, drowns in a 'little river' before he even reaches Jerusalem. Frederick II's impious crusade, mounted as an excommunicate, brings destruction rather than liberation to the Holy Land. The Hohenstaufen are shown failing to fulfil the crusading ideal established by Heraclius and Charlemagne.

Both the ongoing controversy surrounding the Hohenstaufen, particularly Frederick II, and the importance of crusading for the role of the emperor are prominent features in late thirteenth-century thought. Frederick's ongoing conflict with the Pope and eventual deposition resulted in deeply negative portrayals of him in papal sources and by writers aligned with the papacy.⁸² The Curia 'had no difficulty concocting blood-curdling accounts of the errors and sins of Frederick II', and according to the deposition decree, Frederick 'had been guilty of four very serious crimes ... [he] had reduced the clergy and laity of Sicily to beggary and servitude and had persistently refused to repent'.⁸³ Writing the *Chronicon* during his tenure as papal chaplain and penitentiary at the Curia, Martin has an obvious pro-papal bias that makes his criticism of Frederick unsurprising. His Roman perspective also set him apart from ideas about emperorship emerging further west, particularly with regard to crusade. Chris Jones identifies a 'strange transition' of the function of the emperor in a specifically French context after 1250: 'long associated with the defence of the Church...it was transmuted into a specific function: leadership of the crusade'.⁸⁴ Martin presents a view of the imperial office that acknowledges the importance of crusade, but maintains a broader, more complex role for the emperor than that which was emerging in Capetian France. Crusading forms only part of the righteous emperor's responsibilities to Christendom as a whole.

⁸⁰ Stuckey, *Legend of Charlemagne*, p. 138.

⁸¹ Chris Jones notes the use of the *Descriptio qualiter Karolus Magnus* as Vincent of Beauvais's source for Charlemagne's journey to the Holy Land: *Eclipse of Empire*, p. 348.

⁸² For a discussion of the effective papal propaganda against Frederick see Sommerlechner, *Stupor Mundi*, particularly pp. 147-150. For his depiction by clerics in France in particular, see Jones, *Eclipse of Empire*, pp. 32-42.

⁸³ D. Abulafia, *Frederick II: A Medieval Emperor*, London, Penguin, 1988, p. 411; J. A. Watt, 'Spiritual and temporal powers', in Burns (ed.), *Cambridge History of Medieval Political Thought*, p. 385.

⁸⁴ Jones, *Medieval History Journal*, p. 344.

Throughout the *Chronicon*, Martin takes note of acts of piety related to the support of churches and monasteries and the veneration of saints. These not only reinforce an emperor's personal piety, but also practically support the religious devotion of his subjects. Imperial piety must not be restricted to personal displays, but must benefit Christendom as a whole. Practical, tangible acts of piety such as the building or restoration of churches and the acquisition of relics are perhaps the clearest examples, reinforcing a consistent theme of imperial piety as supporting a broader community of believers. Charlemagne is exemplary in his acts of piety: he 'established the Christian religion forever with the greatest piety' in the French kingdom, and in Rome he 'gave generously to the monasteries and churches with many gifts'.⁸⁵ He brought the relics gifted to him by Constantine, including pieces of Christ's crown and cross, a nail from the Passion, items of clothing from Christ and the Virgin, and the arm of St. Symeon, back to Aachen and 'laid them in the basilica of St. Mary, which he had built'.⁸⁶ In a similar vein, Martin notes that Justinian built 'a wonderful church in Constantinople to honour the holy wisdom of Christ'.⁸⁷ Charles the Bald 'built many monasteries and churches or repaired destroyed ones' in France and Italy.⁸⁸ Otto I 'made many donations to churches' during his coronation visit to Rome and 'built a church of remarkable beauty at Magdeburg to honour St. Maurice'.⁸⁹ Constantine I, another exemplary Christian emperor, 'loved the worship of Christ so much that he ordered Christian churches to be built everywhere' and 'founded a church to honour Christ in his own palace of Lateran, which is now called the basilica of the Saviour, so that all humanity knew, [and] there were in their hearts no doubts about the Christian faith, nor remained traces of previous error'.⁹⁰ Here, Martin discusses the significant impact of imperial piety for the development of the Christian faith: Constantine's love for the

⁸⁵ 'Christianum cultum summa pietate semper excoluit...etiam tunc in Urbe monasteriis et ecclesiis multa munera largitus fuit', Martin of Opava, p. 461.

⁸⁶ 'recepit de corona Domini partem, que tunc ipso cernente floruit, et clavum unum passionis Domini, partem crucis dominice, sudarium Domini et camisiam beate Marie et brachium sancti Symeonis, que omnia comitantibus multis miraculis secum detulit et in Aquisgrani in basilica sancte Marie, quam construxerat, reconditit', Martin of Opava, pp. 461-462.

⁸⁷ 'Hic Iustinianus postquam mirificum templum in Constantinopoli ad honorem sancte Sophie id est Christi extruxit', Martin of Opava, p. 456.

⁸⁸ 'Hic Carolus tam in Francia quam in Ytalia multa monasteria et ecclesias construxit vel destructas reparavit', Martin of Opava, p. 463.

⁸⁹ 'multa donaria fecit ecclesiis'; 'in allodio suo apud Magdeburch ecclesiam mire pulchritudinis ad honorem sancti Mauricii fabricavit', Martin of Opava, p. 465.

⁹⁰ 'Nam in tantum Christi cultum dilexit, ut mox baptizatus ecclesias christianorum mandaret unique erigi. Ipse etiam in palacio suo Lateranensi ad honorem Christi ecclesiam, que nunc dicitur basilica Salvatoris, fundavit, ut universitas hominum sciret, nullam in corde suo circa fidem Christi esse dubietatem vel preteriti erroris remansisse vestigia', Martin of Opava, p. 451.

Church prompts him to build magnificent churches, which in turn inspire his subjects to faith. Acts of piety from a Christian emperor act directly to encourage and facilitate religious devotion among the people.

* * *

Taken as a whole, the imperial section of the *Chronicon* reveals a chronicler who is concerned, above all, with the concept of an emperor as the temporal ruler of Christendom. His interest in the legitimacy, military accomplishments, and governance of individual emperors is limited, though the comments he does make reveal an adherence to traditional ecclesiastical ideas about the emperor's role. From the beginning, he characterises the joint rule of the Church by pope and emperor in the terms of the 'two swords'. The legitimacy of an emperor is established or emphasised through papal support and piety; it is diminished through papal deposition, as exemplified by Frederick II, or by impious seizure of the throne, as with Phocas. Emperors who extend the boundary of the empire are celebrated, suggesting an alignment with Gregorian or Augustinian ideas that imperial expansion is part of the Christian emperor's duty in order to facilitate the spread of Christianity. His discussion of imperial decrees that carried death sentences for transgressors corresponds with the emperor's role within the 'two swords' theory as that of secular coercion, and emphasises the danger of this coercion when an emperor enforces impious laws. In his depictions of individual emperors, however, Martin shows far more interest in questions of piety than anything else. The orthodoxy or heresy of an emperor's beliefs, his involvement, if applicable, in crusade, and the tangible contributions he makes to the support of the church are all worthy of comment. These displays of piety or impiety are always linked to their effect on Christendom and the church as a community of believers: orthodox emperors such as Justin and Theodosius restore churches from heretics and inspire pagan conversion through their virtue; heretical emperors corrupt their subjects and actively persecute orthodox Christians; 'crusading' heroes such as Heraclius and Charlemagne liberate captive Christian populations in the Holy Land; other displays of imperial piety such as the foundation of churches and monasteries inspire conversion and facilitate devotion. The role of the emperor in Martin's worldview is dictated by the needs of the Church. The requirements of the Church and the empire are inseparable; both are communities of Christians, and the emperor within his temporal sphere must support Christianity to spread and flourish. The emperor wields the material sword on behalf of Christendom, but only through joint rule with the bearer of the spiritual sword, the pope, is it sufficient.

Chapter 2: *Duo Gladii*: Papal-Imperial Relations in the *Chronicon*

The relationship between spiritual and temporal power was a key aspect of political thought throughout the Middle Ages, usually described with regard to the ‘two swords’ theory that originated with Pope Gelasius I in the fifth century.¹ Historians have identified two differing interpretations of the Gelasian theory, hierocratic and dualist, flourishing in the period between the Investiture Contest beginning in the late-eleventh century and the conflict between King Philip IV of France and Pope Boniface VIII at the turn of the fourteenth century.² Dualist thought, a more traditional view of spiritual and temporal power, interpreted the papacy and empire as holding supreme authority within their respective spheres of influence. The hierocratic theory, in contrast, held that spiritual power was greater and, therefore, that temporal power was subordinate to the authority of the Pope.³ Martin’s *Chronicon*, a chronicle dedicated to the separate and overlapping histories of the great powers of empire and papacy, inevitably engages with questions regarding the interaction of these two powers and the balance of power between them. As Anna-Dorothee von den Brincken notes, the original structure of the chronicle allowed for each year of papal history to be mirrored by imperial history, without separating the spiritual from the temporal; as a result, ‘martyrs, for example, mostly appear with their persecutors on the right’.⁴ The connection between empire and papacy is therefore integral to the structure and purpose of the chronicle itself. This chapter explores Martin’s deliberate construction of the papal-imperial division of power according to what can be interpreted as a ‘dualist’ interpretation of the two swords theory.

¹ For an overview of the development and use of the Gelasian theory until the twelfth century, see R. L. Benson, ‘The Gelasian Doctrine: Uses and Transformations’, in G. Makdisi, D. Sourdél, and J. Sourdél-Thomine (ed.), *La notion d’autorité au Moyen Age: Islam, Byzance, Occident*, Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1982, pp. 13-44.

² While there is a consensus that tension between hierocratic and dualist ideas characterised thought concerning spiritual and temporal power in these centuries, scholars differ on when the hierocratic interpretation emerged and reached its apex. Joseph Canning states that the ‘fully articulated form’ of hierocratic theory ‘only appeared with the papal publicists of the early fourteenth century’, *A History of Medieval Political Thought 300-1450*, 2nd edn., Routledge, London, 2005, p. 94; J. A. Watt, meanwhile, identifies ‘the nearest approach to a full articulation of the hierocratic logic in its simplest form’ in Hugh of St Victor’s *De sacramentis christianae fidei* in the early twelfth century: ‘Spiritual and temporal powers’, in Burns (ed.), *Cambridge History of Medieval Political Thought*, p. 368. Keith Sisson offers the summary that hierocratic ideas ‘flourished during the High Middle Ages (1050-1300) and continued to evolve until the early 14th century’, ‘Popes over Princes: Hierocratic Theory’, in K. Sisson and A. A. Larson (ed.), *A Companion to the Medieval Papacy: Growth of an Ideology and Institution*, Leiden, Brill, 2016, p. 121.

³ For an overview of these terms see Canning, *History of Medieval Political Thought*, pp. 93-95. The term ‘hierocratic’ was popularised by Walter Ullmann; see, in particular, *The Growth of Papal Government in the Middle Ages: a study in the ideological relation of clerical to lay power*, 2nd edn., London, Methuen, 1965, which claims hierocratic theory as a central tenet of papal thought from the Church Fathers onward.

⁴ Von den Brincken, *Medieval Chronicle*, p. 1086.

Scholarship on the medieval understanding of spiritual and temporal authority is extensive, although, much like the wider historiography of political thought, it has a tendency to focus on traditionally ‘political’ sources; in particular, the work of canonists and theologians loom large in this area.⁵ Texts that represent perspectives beyond these narrow categories of theorists are seldom examined for their presentation of the relationship between spiritual and temporal power, though recent contributions to the field have begun to challenge this tendency.⁶ In particular, scholarship on Godfrey of Viterbo, a twelfth-century chronicler who wrote, alternately, for an imperial and papal audience, has engaged with the question of how chroniclers understood and presented the relationship of empire and papacy.⁷

There is a tendency among scholars who have commented on the *Chronicon* to categorise Martin as hierocratic without engaging fully with his ideas.⁸ While Martin is ‘pro-papal’ in the sense that he wrote for a papal audience while working at the Curia, the assumption that he therefore supported a ‘hierocratic’ vision of papal monarchy is overly simplistic and misunderstands both Martin’s own presentation of papal-imperial history and the nuances of the two interpretations. Historians of political thought such as Canning have cautioned against the rigid application of hierocratic and dualist categories and acknowledged

⁵ Ullmann’s studies of hierocratic thought utilise the writings of popes themselves (see, for example, *Medieval Political Thought*, pp. 100-115) as well as the ‘political literature’ produced by theologians and canonists in the wake of the Investiture Contest: *Medieval Political Thought*, pp. 116-129. Similarly, Michael Wilks’s study of papal sovereignty in the later Middle Ages focuses, in particular, on Augustinus Triumphus and the publicists, and draws upon ‘a large number of tracts and treatises, roughly covering the years 1250-1350’: *The Problem of Sovereignty in the Later Middle Ages: The Papal Monarchy with Augustinus Triumphus and the Publicists*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1963, p. ix. For a study drawing on a source base of canonist commentaries, see: J. A. Watt, ‘The Theory of Papal Monarchy in the Thirteenth Century: The Contribution of the Canonists’, *Traditio*, vol. 20, 1964, pp. 179-317; similarly, Watt’s survey of the concept of spiritual and temporal power in the later Middle Ages focuses on the works of key theologians and canonists: *Cambridge History of Medieval Political Thought*, pp. 367-423. Colin Morris, while acknowledging the limited perspective of his chosen sources (pp. 5-6), also relies predominantly on legal and theological texts: *The Papal Monarchy: The Western Church from 1050-1250*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1989. This tendency continues in more recent scholarship such as Sisson’s 2016 chapter, which focuses on the hierocratic and royalist tracts produced during the Franco-papal conflict: *Companion to the Medieval Papacy*, pp. 121-132.

⁶ For an example of a recent study which considers the relationship between spiritual and temporal power in a non-traditional source, see Z. Cole, ‘Representations of Rulership in the *Legenda Aurea*’, unpublished Honours dissertation, University of Canterbury, 2017, permanent link <http://hdl.handle.net/10092/15007>.

⁷ For a discussion of the changes in Godfrey’s intended readership: T. Foerster, ‘Introduction’, in Foerster (ed.), *Godfrey of Viterbo and His Readers*, pp. 2-3. On the relationship between empire and papacy in particular see J. Dunbabin, ‘The Distinctive Elements Among Godfrey of Viterbo’s Political Ideas’, in Foerster (ed.), pp. 37-46, which discusses Godfrey’s presentation of imperial power as equal to and independent from the papacy, particularly at pp. 42-45.

⁸ The most striking example of this is Bert Roest, who refers to the *Chronicon*’s ‘hierocratic, pope-oriented vision of history’ comparable to Bernard Gui and Ptolemy of Lucca: ‘Late Medieval Institutional History’ in Deliyannis (ed.), *Historiography in the Middle Ages*, pp. 308-309. The specific differences in the concepts of empire in Martin’s work and that of Bernard and Ptolemy will be explored in Chapter 4 of this thesis.

that many theorists are somewhere in the middle.⁹ While chroniclers are seldom consulted for their perspectives on the division of spiritual and temporal power, historians should allow for the same complexity and nuance in their thought on the topic as that of more ‘traditional’ theorists. There is an expectation that a chronicler aligned with the papacy would subscribe to a doctrine of papal monarchy, however, Martin’s approach proves that this is not necessarily the case. At the same time, the existence of thirteenth-century papal-imperial chronicles that *did* promote a more ‘hierocratic’ outlook, such as Gilbert of Rome’s *Chronicon Pontificum et Imperatorum Romanorum* written in the 1220s, suggests that Martin was not merely following a predominant understanding of papal-imperial relations in the presentation of his chronicle.

This chapter will demonstrate that Martin not only had a developed dualist idea of the rightful balance of power between empire and papacy, but that he constructed the *Chronicon* to reflect this idea. In addition to his assessment of the character and deeds of individual emperors, Martin’s view of the role of empire is made evident in his presentation of its relationship to its spiritual counterpart, the papacy, and in particular the way he approaches cases of cooperation and conflict between popes and emperors. The chapter will first consider the *Chronicon*’s prefatory statements, which emphasise the importance of both papacy and empire for the rule of Christendom. Martin’s language reflects the commonly-held belief that spiritual power holds greater dignity, but never subordinates the temporal to the spiritual. His presentation of papal and imperial history will be compared to Gilbert of Rome’s near-contemporary papal-imperial chronicle, to highlight the differences in the way each chronicler presents the balance of power. The expression of Martin’s view of power is not restricted to his introductory statements, and a clear dualist division of papal and imperial power informs his treatment of individual papal-imperial relationships. Martin’s construction of the ideal papal-imperial relationship in Sylvester and Constantine will be explored, followed by an examination of emperors such as Leo III, Henry IV, and Frederick II, who came into conflict with the papacy. This approach allows for a thorough analysis of Martin’s presentation of papal-imperial relations.

Martin’s Two Swords

In setting out his concept of papal and imperial power in the prologue to the *Chronicon*, Martin emphasises the separation of these two spheres. His understanding of the dual papal-imperial

⁹ ‘A fundamental problem involved in adopting these terms, “hierocratic” and “dualist”, is that they are not mutually exclusive...Medieval thinkers often did not fit easily into these broad modern categories’, Canning, *History of Medieval Political Thought*, p. 94.

rule of Christendom informs both the purpose and structure of his chronicle. He is concerned with ‘the dual rule of the City, namely the spiritual, which was through the popes, and the temporal, which was through the emperors’.¹⁰ His identification of the two swords with papal and imperial power, discussed in the previous chapter, also highlights the duality of the ‘two reigns’ of the city of Rome and the world. At first glance, however, Martin’s understanding of papal and imperial power does not appear to place both on equal footing. He justifies the layout of his chronicle, with imperial pages following papal ones, because of the superiority of spiritual power over temporal:

There are two great lights which God put in the heavenly sky – that is, in the universal Church – which are papal authority and imperial power. Between these lights, just as the greater light is the sun and the lesser light is the moon, so spiritual power is greater and imperial power lesser. Because of this, wishing to write according to the dignity of both, I [will] write first about the papal on the first page – just as the greater light is present during the day, so is the spiritual; and afterwards concerning the imperial – just as the lesser light is present at night, so is the temporal – on the following page.¹¹

The suggestion that the spiritual power is ‘greater’ than the imperial is, however, a mainstay of dualist as well as hierocratic thought. Keith Sisson identifies a similar concept among medieval theorists critical of hierocratic theory, who argued that ‘even though the priestly power is weightier, this does not necessarily mean that the temporal power is subordinate to the spiritual power in secular matters’.¹² This concept of the greater dignity of the spiritual power, including the imagery of the sun and the moon, can even be found in the writings of the emperor Frederick II, who certainly did not believe in the papacy having superior authority over his office.¹³ Walter Ullmann notes that the sun and moon analogy was ‘well-known’ in the Middle Ages, though he associates the concept exclusively with hierocratic thought.¹⁴ Martin’s

¹⁰ ‘Consequenter agendum est de duplici regimine Urbis, scilicet de spirituali, quod fuit per pontifices, et temporali, quod fuit per imperatores’, Martin of Opava, p. 406.

¹¹ ‘Hec sunt duo luminaria magna, que posuit Deus in firmamento celi, id est in universali ecclesia, que sunt pontificalis auctoritas et imperialis potestas. Inter que luminaria, sicut luminare maius est sol et luminare minus luna, sic spiritualis potestas est maior et imperialis minor. Propter hoc ego de utraque dignitate scribere volens, primo ago de pontificali, tanquam de luminari maiori quod preest diebus, id est spiritualibus, in prima pagina; post de imperiali tanquam de minori quod preest noctibus, id est temporalibus, in sequenti pagina’, Martin of Opava, p. 407.

¹² Sisson, *Companion to the Medieval Papacy*, p. 127.

¹³ For the sun and moon analogy in Frederick’s thought: ‘...in firmamento celi duo statuit luminaria, majus et minus... a simili eadem eterna provisio in firmamento terre duo voluit inesse regimina, sacerdotium scilicet et imperium...’, *Historia Diplomatica Friderici Secundi*, vol. 5, ed. J. L. A. Huillard-Bréholles, Paris, Plon, 1857, p. 348. For a discussion of the emperor’s response to his deposition by Pope Innocent IV, including his denial that the pope had such authority, see Watt, *Cambridge History of Medieval Political Thought*, pp. 385-386.

¹⁴ Ullmann, *Medieval Political Thought*, p. 95.

acknowledgement of the greater dignity of the papacy is a standard interpretation that carries no bearing on the way he perceives the practical authority of either papacy or empire. Von den Brincken further notes that in choosing a layout that presented papal history first, Martin ‘naturally follows the prevailing historiography of his time’.¹⁵

The equal importance of papacy and empire presented by Martin is made more clear in a comparison between his work and that of his immediate predecessor, Gilbert of Rome, who compiled a shorter, less detailed papal-imperial chronicle in around 1220. There is no doubt that Martin was familiar with Gilbert’s chronicle. In the list of sources Martin provides in his prologue, he states that he has drawn from ‘the chronicle of Gilbert, concerning the deeds of both [popes and emperors]’.¹⁶ He quotes verbatim from Gilbert’s chronicle in a number of cases throughout the work, and is unlikely to have accessed the text through any intermediary, given that it was not included in the *Speculum historiale*.¹⁷

Gilbert’s presentation of papal and imperial history continually subordinates the imperial to the papal in terms of significance. While both Martin and Gilbert begin their chronicles with Christ and Augustus, their framing of these starting points differ notably. Martin draws a parallel between Christ and Augustus as the first pope and the first emperor: ‘the pontifical rule of the City and the world began first from Christ, who was the *pontifex* of present and future good; the imperial reign began from Octavian, who was the first emperor and *augustus* of the City and the world’.¹⁸ Gilbert speaks of beginning his chronicle with Christ, ‘who was the first and greatest *pontifex*, and from Octavian Augustus, who reigned in his time’.¹⁹ Martin stresses that imperial rule began with Augustus in the same way that papal rule began with Christ, while Gilbert suggests the imperial section of his chronicle begins with Augustus only because he was contemporaneous with Christ. Martin’s framing of Augustus’s importance is made more significant when one of his other key sources is considered: Vincent

¹⁵ Von den Brincken, *Encyclopedia of the Medieval Chronicle*, p. 1086.

¹⁶ ‘Item ex cronicis Gilberti de gestis utrorumque’, Martin of Opava, *Chronicon*, p. 407.

¹⁷ For examples of Martin’s direct quoting from Gilbert, compare: ‘Iste in omnibus gloriosus leges multas condidit’, Gilbert of Rome, *Chronicon Pontificum et Imperatorum Romanorum*, ed. O. Holder-Egger, MGH, SS, vol. 24, Hannover, 1879, p. 123, with Martin of Opava, p. 446; and ‘Hic constituit, ut clericus nec comam nec barbam nutriat’, Gilbert of Rome, p. 123, with Martin of Opava, p. 410. Given that Gilbert’s was the most recent papal-imperial chronicle available to Martin it would be unusual if he had not consulted it directly.

¹⁸ ‘Et pontificale quidem regimen incepit Urbis et orbis a Christo primum, qui fuit pontifex presencium et futurum bonorum; imperiale vero regimen incepit ab Octaviano, qui primus fuit imperator et augustus Urbis et orbis’, Martin of Opava, p. 406.

¹⁹ ‘Incipiens a Christo, qui fuit primus et summus pontifex, et ab Octaviano Augusto, qui eius tempore imperavit’, Gilbert of Rome, p. 122.

of Beauvais named the first emperor of Rome as Julius Caesar.²⁰ Martin's presentation of Christ and Augustus as the first to hold the offices of pope and emperor is therefore a very deliberate one.

In setting out the purpose of his chronicle, Gilbert states that it will distinguish 'which emperor began [to reign] under which pope'.²¹ The subordination of emperors to popes in terms of their significance is continued within the chronicle itself: Gilbert dates his imperial entries to the corresponding pontificate. For example, 'Tiberius reigned for 18 years in the time of Jesus Christ' and 'Nero reigned for 14 years in the time of Peter'.²² Imperial history is not important in its own right, but rather acts as supporting detail to establish the sitting pope's context. Gilbert's chronicle is straightforward and brief, and makes no overt claims regarding the nature of spiritual and temporal authority. This sets it apart from chronicles which can be seen as explicitly supporting a vision of papal supremacy,²³ though its framework clearly establishes papal history as more important than imperial. The differences in the way Gilbert and Martin have presented papal and imperial history are clear, and Martin's direct engagement with Gilbert's chronicle carries further implications. Martin deliberately avoided reproducing Gilbert's worldview, consciously adopting a more 'dualist' approach than his predecessor that emphasised the equal importance of empire and papacy each in its own rights.

Martin's apparent rejection of a hierocratic presentation of papal and imperial history appears unusual given his ties to the papal Curia and the papacy's support of his work. The assumption that the Curia could only support a hierocratic presentation of history is evident in Bert Roest's comment that 'thanks to its hierocratic, pope-oriented vision of history...Martin's *Chronicon* was more or less officially adopted by the papal curia'.²⁴ The extent to which the papacy was pursuing a 'hierocratic' policy at the time Martin was compiling the *Chronicon*, however, is questionable. Scholars have generally agreed that papal claims to hierocratic supremacy in the thirteenth century were expressed predominantly by Innocent III, Gregory IX, and Innocent IV.²⁵ Innocent IV had died fourteen years before the first recension of the

²⁰ '...tenuitque praefatus Caesar imperium primus', *Speculum historiale*, book 5, ch. 117, p. 172, cited from Jones, *Medieval History Journal*, p. 323.

²¹ '...et distinguitur, quis imperator sub quo papa incepit', Gilbert of Rome, p. 122.

²² 'Tyberius tempore Ihesu Christi imperavit annis 18'; 'Nero tempore Petri imperavit annis 14', Gilbert of Rome, p. 122.

²³ An example of such a chronicle is the early fourteenth-century *Annales* of Ptolemy of Lucca, which is discussed in detail in Chapter 4 of this thesis.

²⁴ Roest, *Historiography in the Middle Ages*, p. 308.

²⁵ Canning notes that Innocent III 'injected what were to be the most important papal contributions to this debate' and his pontificate was 'the crux of the medieval papacy', and that 'it would be misleading to say that Innocent IV went much beyond Innocent III', *History of Medieval Political Thought*, pp. 121-124. Watt notes

Chronicon was completed in 1268, and the next pope to attempt a serious claim to papal supremacy over temporal rulers, Boniface VIII, did not ascend to the Holy See until 1294.²⁶ Pontiffs who subscribed to a hierocratic doctrine seem, therefore, to be more of an exception than a rule in the thirteenth century; certainly, there is no evidence that the popes whom Martin served during his tenure as chaplain and penitentiary would have done so.²⁷ Martin is unapologetically ‘pro-papal’ in his sympathies; he is also clearly a dualist. The two are not mutually exclusive.

Cooperation: The Constantinian Model

Martin’s dualist vision of pope and emperor holding joint responsibility for the universal Church suggests an idealistic model of papal-imperial cooperation, which is exemplified in the *Chronicon* by the relationship between Pope Sylvester and Constantine the Great. The idea of Sylvester and Constantine as models of an ideal papal-imperial relationship has been recognised by historians in various contexts throughout the empire from the early Middle Ages onward. Edward Brett identifies links between Sylvester and Constantine being made in the West by the fifth century to strengthen the emperor’s connection with Rome, intending to ‘make Pope Sylvester the friend, mentor and confidant of the saint-emperor’.²⁸ Gerd Althoff suggests that Sylvester II’s choice of papal name in 999 was ‘certainly programmatic’ and linked to Sylvester I’s connection to Constantine and his reception of the ‘Donation of

that ‘the papal theory of the Holy Roman Empire was to be brought to completion’ with Innocent III and IV: *Cambridge History of Medieval Political Thought*, p. 378. Geoffrey Barraclough comments that while Innocent III was influential in the development of theories concerning papal monarchy, papal claims to control over secular power did not come until Gregory IX and Innocent IV: *The Medieval Papacy*, London, Thames & Hudson, 1968, pp. 113-114.

²⁶ Bernhard Schimmelpfennig notes that Boniface VIII’s *Unam sanctam* ‘fixed dogmatically and intensified’ the ideas of Innocent III and Gregory IX, alongside Boniface’s own interpretation of the two swords, and that it ‘emphasised stronger than ever the papal position’, *The Papacy*, New York, Columbia University Press, 1992, pp. 181-196. Canning describes *Unam sanctam* as ‘nothing new: it was stitched together from statements and arguments culled from theological sources’, though it was unique as an ‘official papal exposition of the general principles determining the subordination of secular to ecclesiastical power’, and that not even Innocent III’s *Venerabilem* or *Per venerabilem* were comparable: *History of Medieval Political Thought*, p. 139. The assessment of Boniface as unique in the extent of his hierocratic claims is also echoed by Sisson, who notes that papal apologists ‘at the behest of Boniface VIII’ took hierocratic arguments ‘to their ultimate conclusion’: *Companion to the Medieval Papacy*, p. 131.

²⁷ These included Urban IV, Clement IV, Gregory X, Innocent V, Hadrian V, John XXI, and Nicholas III; von den Brincken notes that Martin was attested papal chaplain and penitentiary from 1261 and appointed archbishop of Gnesen in mid-1278: *Encyclopedia of the Medieval Chronicle*, p. 1085.

²⁸ E. Brett, ‘Early Constantine Legends: A Study in Propaganda’, *Byzantine Studies* 10, 1983, p. 67, cited in M. J. Schenck, ‘Constantine, St. Sylvester, and Charlemagne: Iconography of *Regnum et Sacerdotium* in the Sylvester Window at Chartres’, in P. E. Bennett, L. Z. Morgan, and F. R. Psaki (ed.), *The Epic Imagination in Medieval Literature: Essays in Honor of Alice M. Colby-Hall*, University, M.S., University of Mississippi, 2016, p. 91.

Constantine' that purported to grant Rome to the pope.²⁹ The reigning emperor, Otto III, he notes, 'presided jointly with his new pope over a Roman Easter synod', indicating an apparent commitment to papal-imperial cooperation.³⁰ In her discussion of the twelfth-century vernacular German *Kaiserchronik*, Janet Nelson argues that it presents Constantine and Sylvester as 'a model of collaboration reproduced by Charlemagne and Leo'.³¹ Both these cases reveal later popes and emperors consciously modelling themselves, or being modelled, after Sylvester and Constantine. The concept of Sylvester and Constantine as models of ideal papal-imperial cooperation was therefore an established one by the time Martin wrote the *Chronicon*.

Within the *Chronicon*, Constantine, as discussed in the first chapter, acts out of piety and spiritual devotion to facilitate Christian worship throughout the empire. He is aided in his mission by Sylvester, who is responsible for the emperor's baptism and acts to establish Christianity alongside the emperor. Martin's original side-by-side chronicle layout allows for the immediate comparison between popes and emperors. There is little need in this structure for cross-referencing within entries to respective popes and emperors, but Sylvester and Constantine feature prominently in each other's entries, emphasising the cooperative nature of their relationship. In Constantine's entry, Sylvester is credited as an agent of salvation, who prompts Constantine's baptism and the 'Donation of Constantine': 'He...was baptised by Pope Sylvester on account of being cleansed of leprosy, because of which he granted all imperial dignities to the pope and moved himself across to Constantinople'.³² In a further refutation of the rumours that Constantine was rebaptised as an Arian, Martin points to the power and significance of the emperor's baptism, '...which was carried out by the blessed Sylvester, through which he [Constantine] knew that he was cleansed bodily of leprosy and spiritually of sin...'.³³ The Basilica of the Saviour at Lateran, the foundation of which Martin uses to illustrate Constantine's devotion to the Church, is mentioned as consecrated by Sylvester.³⁴

Throughout Constantine's entry, Sylvester is shown acting as the agent through which the emperor comes to faith and as supportive of his subsequent acts of piety. Similarly, in the papal section Sylvester's pontificate is given significance through his influence over the

²⁹ G. Althoff, *Otto III*, trans. P. G. Jestic, University Park, PA., Pennsylvania State University Press, 2003, p. 93.

³⁰ Althoff, *Otto III*, p. 93.

³¹ J. Nelson, 'Kingship and Empire', in Burns (ed.), *Cambridge History of Medieval Political Thought*, p. 250.

³² 'Iste...a Silvestro papa causa mundandi a lepra baptizatus est, unde omnes imperiales dignitates pape contulit et ipse Constantinopolim transiit', Martin of Opava, p. 450.

³³ '...ut baptismum, quod a beato Silvestro susceperat, per quod se et corporaliter a lepra et spiritualiter a peccato mundatum cognoverat', Martin of Opava, p. 451.

³⁴ 'Quam ecclesiam sanctus Silvester papa sollempniter consecravit', Martin of Opava, p. 451.

emperor's spiritual life. Martin first mentions Sylvester's healing and baptism of Constantine,³⁵ and then, remarkably, devotes the next eight lines entirely to Constantine's foundation of churches in Rome, including the basilica of St Lawrence, the basilica of the Saviour at the Lateran, and the churches of Peter and Paul.³⁶ A number of other deeds attributed to Sylvester are either connected to Constantine, such as the conversion of Helena, or echo his conversion story, such as when 'the blessed Sylvester liberated Rome from a demonic pestilence and a great part of the City was baptised'.³⁷ This latter miracle parallels Constantine's liberation from another pestilence – leprosy – and his subsequent conversion and baptism.

In the attention he gives to Constantine's foundation of churches throughout Sylvester's pontificate, Martin follows the example set by the *Liber pontificalis*, his main source, alongside Vincent of Beauvais's *Speculum*, for Sylvester's section. The *Liber pontificalis*, a collection of papal lives, is the first source that appears in the list of authorities Martin consulted for the *Chronicon* under the title 'Chronicle of Pope Damasus', named for the fourth-century pontiff originally believed to have compiled it.³⁸ While the *Liber pontificalis* was continued by multiple different authors throughout the early Middle Ages, the basis of the surviving text that contained the lives of the early popes, including Sylvester, can be dated to around the mid-sixth century.³⁹ The *Liber pontificalis* includes extensive catalogues of Constantine's gifts to churches he founded as part of its account of Sylvester's pontificate; indeed, they form the majority of the account.⁴⁰ In both the *Liber pontificalis* and Martin's chronicle, the discussion of Constantine's contributions in the context of Sylvester's pontificate attribute these contributions, indirectly, to the pope as the agent of the emperor's salvation. This is in stark contrast to Gilbert of Rome's accounts of both Sylvester and Constantine, which downplay the cooperation between pope and emperor. Sylvester's healing and baptism of Constantine is

³⁵ 'Hic baptizavit Constantinum imperatorem valida scalaris lepra perfusum, qui statim a lepra mundatus', Martin of Opava, p. 415.

³⁶ Martin of Opava, p. 415.

³⁷ 'Postquam vero beatus Sylvester a drachonis pestilencia Romam liberavit, maxima pars Urbis baptiza fuit', Martin of Opava, p. 415.

³⁸ Martin of Opava, p. 407. For an introduction to the *Liber pontificalis*, see D. Deliyannis, 'Liber pontificalis', in Dunphy (ed.), *Encyclopedia of the Medieval Chronicle*, vol. 2, p. 1028. For its compilation history, see R. Davis, 'Introduction', in R. Davis (ed.), *The Book of Pontiffs: The ancient biographies of the first ninety Roman bishops to AD 715*, 2nd edn., Liverpool, Liverpool University Press, 2000, pp. xi-xvi. For its influence on local and institutional historiography in the Middle Ages: M. Sot, 'Local and Institutional History (300-1000)', in Deliyannis (ed.), *Historiography in the Middle Ages*, pp. 96-101.

³⁹ Davis, *Book of Pontiffs*, p. xiii.

⁴⁰ See *Liber pontificalis*, vol. 1, ed. L. Duchesne, Paris, Libraire des écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, 1886, pp. 170-187. In a discussion about the content of the early *Liber pontificalis*, Michel Sot notes the inclusion of 'political information on the role of the emperor Constantine in relation to Pope Sylvester', *Historiography in the Middle Ages*, p. 99.

mentioned, but the pope is given sole credit for the Council of Nicaea;⁴¹ conversely, Gilbert mentions the Donation of Constantine in his imperial section but does not discuss the emperor's role in founding churches. Martin draws directly from Gilbert's imperial section for his comment on Constantine's conversion and the Donation,⁴² but goes into much greater detail to establish the emperor's genuine faith, his contributions to the Church, and the role of Sylvester in both. The conversion of Helena and the healing of Rome from pestilence, both stories that echo the themes of Constantine's own conversion, are taken from Vincent of Beauvais, appearing neither in the *Liber pontificalis* nor in Gilbert's chronicle.⁴³

These additions and interpolations suggest a deliberate attempt by Martin to create more substantial links between Sylvester and Constantine than exist in any of his sources. Their relationship is cooperative and mutually beneficial, and provides a model for the ideal functioning of the papal-imperial relationship: through Sylvester's intercession in healing and baptism, Constantine comes to the faith; his subsequent dedication to Christianity prompts him to use his imperial power and wealth for the benefit of the Church. Their interdependence emphasises the importance of dual papal-imperial rule for Christendom, with both roles clearly separated and defined: Constantine can build churches, but he needs Sylvester to consecrate them. The accounts of both Constantine and Sylvester have been carefully constructed to show the beginning of a fully Christian papal-imperial partnership. While the joint rule of 'the city and the world' began with Christ and Augustus, Constantine's baptism by Sylvester marks a significant moment that sets a precedent for the cooperation of pope and emperor for the benefit of the Church. As Rome becomes Christianised, pope and emperor are – literally and figuratively – on the same page.

Conflict and Excommunication

While Constantine and Sylvester represent a model of the ideal papal-imperial relationship, a far more prominent feature of the chronicle is that of failed papal-imperial relations marked by conflict and, in particular, excommunication. In his accounts of conflict between popes and emperors, Martin is guided by two aims: he is clearly writing with a papal audience in mind – the blame for tensions between the empire and the papacy are laid at the feet of the emperors

⁴¹ 'Hic baptizavit Constantinum imperatorem et a lepra mundavit, et primam synodum in Nycena Bithinie celebravit cum 318 patribus', Gilbert of Rome, p. 125.

⁴² '...a Silvestro papa causa mundandi a lepra baptizatus est et mundatus, unde omnes imperiales dignitates ei concessit, et ipse Constantinopolim transiit', Gilbert of Rome, p. 125, cf. Martin of Opava above.

⁴³ See Vincent of Beauvais, *Speculum historiale*, book 13, ch. 50-53, pp. 522-523; cf. *Liber pontificalis* pp. 170-187 and Gilbert of Rome, p. 125.

concerned – but his vision of papal and imperial power remains consistent. Emperors who fall foul of the papacy do so because of spiritual transgressions, and Martin saves his harshest judgement for those who defy the papal ‘sword’ of excommunication and therefore reject the Church’s authority in its sphere.

Both of these concerns can be seen in the treatment of the eleventh-century Investiture Contest through Pope Gregory VII and Henry IV (identified as Henry III in the *Chronicon*). The conflict is introduced in the papal section with Henry’s excommunication: ‘This pope excommunicated the emperor Henry III [IV], having held a council of 110 bishops, because [the emperor] wanted to tear apart the unity of the Roman Church’.⁴⁴ This statement echoes the wording of a letter from Pope Gregory to the German Church justifying Henry’s excommunication, ‘because [the emperor] was not afraid to tear apart the body of Christ, that is, the unity of the holy Church’.⁴⁵ Martin is likely to have had access to this letter, suggesting that his use of it was a conscious and deliberate choice of wording: while he does not quote from any other part of the letter, it is an extended defense of the pope’s authority to excommunicate the emperor on the basis of sin.⁴⁶ By referring to the emperor’s behaviour as a threat to the Church’s unity, Martin emphasises that Gregory was acting within his spiritual jurisdiction.

The *Chronicon*’s overall treatment of Henry in the Investiture Contest reveals a complex approach that reproaches the emperor for his conduct towards the Church, but also gives him the benefit of the doubt regarding his reconciliation. In discussing the events of Canossa in 1077,⁴⁷ Martin emphasises the emperor’s extreme penance: ‘But after [excommunication], coming to the pope in Lombardy and standing for many days in bare feet on snow and ice, he [Henry] finally obtained absolution’.⁴⁸ The reconciliation at Canossa is a key factor in Martin’s treatment of the emperor. For example, the papal section makes Henry

⁴⁴ ‘Hic pontifex Henricum III. imperatorem, concilio 110 episcoporum habito, excommunicavit, quia Romane ecclesie unitatem scindere voluit’, Martin of Opava, p. 434.

⁴⁵ ‘...necnon quod corpus Christi id est unitatem sancte ecclesie scindere non expavit’, Pope Gregory VII, *Epistolae Vagantes*, ed. H. E. J. Cowdrey, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1972, pp. 38-40.

⁴⁶ Cowdrey notes that this letter was ‘amongst the most important of all Gregory’s letters, and the extensive MS. attestation in many kinds of source indicates that it circulated widely’, Cowdrey, ‘Notes to letter 14’, in Cowdrey (ed.), *Epistolae Vagantes*, p. 32. Martin likely accessed the letter through the twelfth-century *Vita Gregorii VII* of Paul of Bernried, which included the text of the letter to the German Church in addition to other pieces of Gregory’s correspondence in full. See Paul of Bernried, *Vita Gregorii VII*, in J. M. Watterich (ed.), *Pontificum Romanum Vitae*, vol. 1, Leipzig, Engelmann, 1862, pp. 474-546. For the letter: pp. 517-520. This wording does not appear in Vincent of Beauvais or Gilbert of Rome, Martin’s most likely intermediaries.

⁴⁷ For a summary of the reconciliation at Canossa see Morris, *Papal Monarchy*, pp. 116-117, and H. E. J. Cowdrey, *Pope Gregory VII: 1073-1085*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1998, pp. 156-158.

⁴⁸ Martin of Opava, p. 434.

complicit in the deposition of Gregory, rather than directly responsible. After Henry's reconciliation with the pope at Canossa, 'many troublesome excommunicated bishops [again], by the consent of that same king, gathering at Brissina elected Guibert bishop of Ravenna to the papacy, naming him Clement'.⁴⁹ The imperial section, however, makes no mention of Canossa and lays the blame for the deposition more directly on Henry, stating that the emperor himself deposed Gregory from the papacy and established Guibert of Ravenna in his place.⁵⁰ The picture of Henry that emerges in the papal section is notably more sympathetic than that which is found in Henry's own entry in the imperial section; it is also considerably closer to the truth. Colin Morris notes that the deposition of Gregory 'was carried out by an assembly consisting mainly of the intransigent Lombard bishops'.⁵¹ While the bishops were supported in their decision by Henry, the emperor himself was not responsible for the proclamation.

Yet Henry is clearly culpable in both the papal and imperial sections, and Martin allows for no ambiguity regarding the innocence and legitimacy of Gregory. This is further evident in the differences between Martin's material and the *Speculum historiale*, one of his key sources for the period. While Vincent of Beauvais refers to the pope by his birth name, Hildebrand, in the material Martin is drawing from, the latter does not; the use of birth name over papal name is, instead, reserved for the antipope Guibert.⁵² Gregory's death also suggests divine favour: 'Afterwards, he died coming down into Apulia from Salerno, with a miraculous flashing of light'.⁵³ Martin's presentation of the reconciliation at Canossa is markedly different to that of Vincent of Beauvais, who, after his comment that the Saxon princes rebelled 'at the instigation of Pope Hildebrand' notes that 'this pope, meeting with the emperor under a false peace in Lombardy, absolved him'.⁵⁴ Vincent presents the pope as a co-conspirator with the Saxon princes, a vastly different image to that created by Martin. The difference between Vincent and Martin may go some way in explaining the different presentations of Henry in the *Chronicon's* papal and imperial sections. While Martin drew predominantly from biographies of Gregory

⁴⁹ 'Sed post de consensu eiusdem regis iterato excommunicati plurimi sediciosi episcopi apud Brissinam convenientes Guipertum Ravennatem episcopum in papam elegerunt, Clementem vocantes...' Martin of Opava, p. 434.

⁵⁰ 'Imperator vero Maguncie Gregorium a papatu, quantum in eo fuit, deposuit, Guipertum Ravennatem episcopum pro ipso constituens', Martin of Opava, p. 468.

⁵¹ Morris, *Papal Monarchy*, p. 118.

⁵² For Vincent's use of Hildebrand, see *Speculum historiale*, esp. book 25, ch. 51-65, pp. 1020-1024; for Martin's use of Gregory and Guibert, *Chronicon* p. 434 for the papal section, and p. 468 for the imperial.

⁵³ 'Qui post in Apuliam descendens Salerni mortuus est miraculis coruschando', Martin of Opava, p. 434.

⁵⁴ '...Saxones rebellant instinctu Hildebrandi Papae. Ipse Papa occurrens Imperatori in Longobardia sub falsa eum pace absolvit', Vincent of Beauvais, book 25, ch. 51, p. 1020.

VII for the papal section, he made much greater use of Vincent in the imperial section.⁵⁵ The presentation in the imperial section of Henry as an unrepentant tormentor of the Church and Gregory as his victim may have been a response to Vincent's unflattering portrait of Gregory: Martin is attempting to 'set the record straight' regarding Gregory's character, and Henry is (not wholly undeserving) collateral damage.

The influence of a papal audience for Martin's work is clear, but the chronicle does not condemn Henry outright in the same way as some other emperors who come into conflict with the papacy. It does not, for example, question Henry's legitimacy as emperor, despite the fact that he was crowned by an antipope.⁵⁶ While Martin leaves no doubt about the apportioning of blame for the Investiture Contest, he is more interested in establishing Gregory's innocence than condemning Henry. The papal section in particular, by including Henry's excommunication, the reason behind it, and Henry's subsequent penance and absolution, presents a model of papal justice and imperial reconciliation. Both pope and emperor have, through these actions, responded in a suitable manner to the conflict. The issue, then, becomes Henry's support of the antipope. Martin is, therefore, able to condemn Henry for his role in the deposition of Gregory, while also presenting the effectiveness of excommunication as a form of correction for wayward emperors.

Despite Henry IV's multitude of sins, his conflict with the papacy does not render him unforgivable, as he responded appropriately to his excommunication by humbling himself and seeking reconciliation. Some of Martin's harshest judgements are reserved for those emperors who continue in their impiety after refusing papal correction, and it is this failure to respect spiritual authority that forms the major point of difference in the *Chronicon's* treatment of Henry IV and other emperors who came into conflict with the papacy. Excommunication functions as the 'spiritual sword', a specific role that emerged among Carolingian writers and popes in the ninth century.⁵⁷ Under this definition of the functions of papal power, an emperor ignoring or failing to respond to excommunication rejects the spiritual sword, and threatens the very foundations of a joint papal-imperial reign over Christendom.

The clearest example of this is Frederick II, whose failure to recognise excommunication leads to his total alienation from the papacy. In addition to the subtle

⁵⁵ Weiland notes that the papal entry was taken from the *gestae* of Gregory: *Chronicon*, p. 434; and indicates Martin's substantial use of Vincent in Henry's section: pp. 467-468.

⁵⁶ '...cum imperator sibi populi Romani favorem atraxisset, intrans Urbem, predictum Guipertum in papam consecrari facens, ab ipso in imperatorem coronatur', Martin of Opava, p. 468.

⁵⁷ Robinson, *Cambridge History of Medieval Political Thought*, pp. 302-303.

invalidations of his reign and the dismissal of his crusading efforts discussed in the previous chapter, Frederick is presented, ultimately, as an enduring enemy of the Church. Martin's opening assessment of the emperor states that 'this man, educated from infancy by the Church as if by a mother and raised to the summit of the empire, did not value the Church of God like a mother, but destroyed her as if she were a stepmother, as much as he was able to do so'.⁵⁸ Because of this, 'Pope Honorius, who had crowned him, learning of his rebellion against him and enmity to the Church, excommunicated him and absolved all the barons of their fidelity to him'.⁵⁹ Frederick was never actually excommunicated by Honorius. David Abulafia describes Frederick and Honorius's relationship as a 'golden era in papal-imperial collaboration' and states that Honorius 'accepted that differences of outlook...could more easily be settled by gentle persuasion than by thundering denunciation'.⁶⁰ Martin lifts this idea of an excommunication by Honorius from Vincent of Beauvais, but adds the comment about Honorius's coronation of Frederick.⁶¹ What may have been a simple factual error becomes, for Martin, a more direct act of rebellion by Frederick against a pope who raised him to the imperial throne. Martin's chronology of Frederick's reign also differs notably from Vincent's, displacing the emperor's crusade to make it seem to be the reason for his deposition at Lyon. The below shows a comparison between the sequence of events presented by Vincent in the *Speculum historiale* and Martin in the *Chronicon*:

Vincent	Martin
Excommunication by Honorius	Excommunication by Honorius
Crusade while excommunicate	Excommunication by Gregory
Excommunication by Gregory	Capture of papal legates
Capture of papal legates	Crusade while excommunicate
Deposition at Council of Lyon	Deposition at Council of Lyon

Vincent's comment regarding Frederick's crusade is sandwiched between his excommunication by Honorius and the election of Gregory IX following Honorius's death.⁶²

⁵⁸ 'Hic ab infancia per ecclesiam tamquam per matrem Dei non fovit tamquam matrem, sed tamquam novercam quantum potuit laniavit', Martin of Opava, p. 471.

⁵⁹ 'Propter quod Honorius papa, qui ipsum coronaverat, sibi rebellem et ecclesie Romane adversarium comperiens, ipsum anathematizavit et omnes barones a sua absolvit', Martin of Opava, p. 471.

⁶⁰ Abulafia, *Frederick II*, p. 162.

⁶¹ '...Honorius Papa...Hic imperatorem Fridericum sibi rebellem, et adversarium ecclesie Romanae comperiens anathematizavit, atque barones suos ab eius fidelitate absolvit', Vincent of Beauvais, *Speculum historiale*, book 30, ch. 129, p. 1277. Cf. Martin of Opava above.

⁶² See Vincent of Beauvais, *Speculum historiale*, book 30, ch. 129, p. 1277.

Several pages later, he mentions Frederick's dispute with Gregory and excommunication in 1239 and Frederick's capture of the papal legates; finally, he opens Book 31 of the *Speculum historiale* with Frederick's deposition at the council of Lyon.⁶³ Vincent's chronology is more or less an accurate reflection of what actually happened. Martin, while frequently using material verbatim from Vincent, rearranges it to obscure or distort the chronology of Frederick's reign. From the excommunication by Honorius, Martin jumps forward to 1236, and 'in this time the discord that once arose between the emperor and Pope Honorius was renewed with excommunication by Gregory'.⁶⁴ This is followed by Frederick's capture of the papal legates and the suggestion that Frederick was responsible for the suffocation of his son Henry 'in the filth of prison'.⁶⁵ Only then does Martin mention Frederick's crusade, most of the wording for which he lifts directly from Vincent; he adds, however, that the crusade brought 'more desolation than consolation to the Holy Land'.⁶⁶ This is followed immediately by his deposition by Pope Innocent IV.⁶⁷ Martin's reliance on Vincent for the wording of much of this account leaves little doubt that he deliberately rearranged Vincent's material. He includes no dates for either the crusade or the deposition, leaving the clear implication that it was the one that led to the other. There is also, notably, no mention of any attempt by Frederick to reconcile with the papacy. Martin's narrative is one of a resolutely impious emperor who existed in an ongoing state of excommunication and whose blatant dismissal of papal authority by going on crusade while excommunicated was the final straw that resulted in his deposition.

Martin's approach towards emperors who failed to recognise or respond properly to excommunication is most clear in the account of Frederick II, but it also appears as an element in the condemnation of heretical emperors such as the iconoclast Leo III. In his account of Pope Gregory II, Martin states that the pope, in response to Leo's order to burn the images, 'not only

⁶³ For the second excommunication and capture of the legates, see Vincent of Beauvais, book 30, ch. 138, p. 1280; for the deposition, book 31, ch. 1, p. 1286.

⁶⁴ 'Hoc quoque tempore olim discordia inter imperatorem et Honorium papam orta a Gregorio cum anathemate renovatur', Martin of Opava, p. 471, cf. 'His vero temporibus orta interum inter Papa et Imperatorem discordia, Imperator excommunicatus...', Vincent of Beauvais, book 30, ch. 138, p. 1280.

⁶⁵ 'Hic Fredericus, proprium filium, Henricum nomine, regem tunc Alamannie, accusatum sibi de rebellione, captum in Apuliam deducens, carceris squalore suffocavit', Martin of Opava, p. 471. It is unclear where Martin derived this information since it does not appear in Vincent of Beauvais. Presumably, it was a rumour he heard himself. Henry in fact died by suicide on his way to the imperial court in 1242: Abulafia, *Frederick II*, p. 241.

⁶⁶ 'Hic imperator cruce dudum signatus durante sententia excommunicationis mare transivit, maiorem desolationem Terre Sancte quam consolationem relinquens', Martin of Opava, p. 471, cf. 'Denique Imperator iam antea cruce signatus, durante anathematis sententia mare transivit', Vincent of Beauvais, book 30, ch. 129, p. 1277.

⁶⁷ 'Postquam autem ab Innocencio papa depositus esset ab imperio, principes elegerunt contra ipsum lancravium Turingie', Martin of Opava, p. 471.

refused to do so, but also excommunicated the emperor for it'.⁶⁸ His successor, Gregory III, in response to the 'incurable' Leo's continued policy of iconoclasm, 'confirmed the veneration of sacred images and excommunicated violators by general decree'.⁶⁹ These accounts emphasise repeated papal attempts to address the heresy of iconoclasm through excommunication, to which Leo was impervious. In Leo's own section, the emperor's refusal to accept papal correction is again emphasised: 'for this error, Pope Gregory greatly refuted him in writings, but [it was] in vain'.⁷⁰ Papal attempts to combat iconoclasm began in 711 with Pope Constantine, who 'denounced the emperor Philip [Philippicus] as a heretic, because he had destroyed the images of the saints'.⁷¹ Martin's discussion of iconoclasm as a whole is first and foremost a denouncement of a heretical doctrine and the emperors who propagated it, but it also acts to show the effects of impious emperors who dismissed the spiritual authority of the papacy. Those popes faced with iconoclastic emperors condemned both the doctrine and the emperors concerned; by continuing in their error, the emperors rejected the papal sword and caused irreversible damage to Christendom.

Martin's treatment of emperors who disobeyed the pope is consistent, despite the differences in their circumstances. He makes it clear that the emperors' transgressions were clearly of a spiritual nature, and therefore within the pope's jurisdiction. Iconoclasm was a doctrinal matter on which the iconoclast emperors outright rejected the pope's authority; Frederick II, meanwhile, failed to fulfil his crusading vow before embarking on the holy expedition under excommunication. While there are other factors that contribute to Martin's harsh judgement of these emperors, such as the heretical aspect of iconoclasm and the strength of contemporary papal feeling against Frederick II, the defiance of the pope's spiritual authority is a clear thread connecting them throughout the *Chronicon*.

* * *

Throughout the *Chronicon*, Martin maintains a coherent and consistent vision of the symbiotic relationship between empire and papacy. The opening statements of the *Chronicon* place

⁶⁸ 'Hic etiam, cum Leo imperator ymagines...igne cremari iussisset, idem ipsi facere precipiens, non solum facere renuit, sed etiam imperatorem pro ipso anathematizavit', Martin of Opava, p. 425.

⁶⁹ 'Hic Gregorius cum Leonem imperatorem de deposicione ymaginum Christi et sanctorum incorrigibilem vidisset...veneracionem sanctarum ymaginum confirmat atque violatores generali sententia anathematizat', Martin of Opava, p. 425.

⁷⁰ ...pro quo errore eum Gregorius papa in scriptis, sed in vacuum, multum redarguit', Martin of Opava, p. 460.

⁷¹ 'Hic etiam Philippum imperatorem denunciavit hereticum, eo quod sanctorum ymagines deleverat', Martin of Opava, p. 425. Philippicus was indeed a heretic, though of the monothelite variety rather than an iconoclast: see J. N. D. Kelly, *The Oxford Dictionary of Popes*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1986, p. 86.

emperor and pope on equal footing and present the governance of ‘the city and the world’ as decisively dualistic, while granting the conventional ‘greater dignity’ to the papacy. Martin builds a framework that emphasises the equal importance of spiritual and temporal rule, establishing Christ and Augustus as the first holders of their respective offices. The importance of this dual rule is evident again with Sylvester and Constantine, the first pope and emperor to work together in serving Christendom. They serve as a model of papal-imperial cooperation, with each supporting the other to grow the Church.

The *Chronicon*’s treatment of conflict between empire and papacy clearly shows its compiler’s pro-papal bias, but its dualist outlook remains consistent throughout. Conflict is caused by imperial transgression rather than papal fault, but these transgressions are shown to be spiritual in nature and therefore within the pope’s jurisdiction. The emperor’s response to papal correction, particularly in the form of excommunication, informs Martin’s treatment of him. Henry IV’s attempts to reconcile with Gregory VII at Canossa spare him the invective Martin directs at those emperors who failed to respond appropriately to excommunication, namely Frederick II and the iconoclast Leo III. Excommunication, the coercive function of the ‘spiritual sword’, is a tangible representation of papal authority; emperors who ignore excommunication are denying this authority and threatening the model of shared spiritual and temporal power. Martin offers a clear example of a chronicler working in the heart of the Curia who rejects a hierocratic doctrine of papal monarchy in favour of distinct, equal roles for pope and emperor in the governance of Christendom.

Chapter 3: *Frater Martinus Ordinis Praedicatorum: The Chronicon* and its Context

Martin's worldview and his perspective on empire and emperor did not develop in a vacuum. The concerns of the papacy left a clear mark on the *Chronicon* in its depiction of papal-imperial conflict and those emperors who fell foul of the Church, which is unsurprising given its compiler's close connection to the Curia. Martin's brief autobiographical statement, however, reveals a chronicler as defined equally by his order as by his career in Rome: he is 'brother Martin of the Order of Preachers, penitentiary and chaplain to the lord Pope'.¹ This chapter places Martin in his broader context in the thirteenth century by examining the distinctly Dominican influences on his work and locating his thought alongside that of his Dominican contemporaries.

The thirteenth-century Order of Preachers does not represent a single intellectual or cultural milieu. From the outset of her study on the Dominican early education system, M. Michèle Mulchahey highlights the differences between the early Order's modern reputation for innovation and the reality of its conservative curriculum.² Similarly, Jacques Le Goff notes that the Dominicans 'are often represented as essentially intellectuals', but that 'for the most part, they were simple friars' and the Order's intellectuals were a minority.³ While they loom large in perceptions of Dominican contributions to knowledge, Parisian theologians such as Thomas Aquinas represent a small proportion of the Order's thought, one which was often isolated, poorly circulated, or simply unacceptable even among the Order itself.⁴ The sheer diversity of the Order's brethren prompted comment from the fifth Master-General, Humbert of Romans, who offered the following as an explanation for the lack of uniformity across Dominican houses:

¹ 'Ego frater Martinus ordinis Predicatorum, domni pape penitenciarius et capellanus', Martin of Opava, *Chronicon*, p. 397.

² Mulchahey, *Dominican Education*, p. 54.

³ Le Goff, *In Search of Sacred Time*, pp. 5-6.

⁴ For an early example of the tension between Dominican Parisian theologians and the leadership of the Order, see Kevin White's discussion of the debate concerning the knowledge of God and its condemnation in the 1240s: 'The *Quodlibeta* of Thomas Aquinas in the Context of His Work', in C. Schabel (ed.), *Theological Quodlibeta in the Middle Ages: The Thirteenth Century*, Leiden, Brill, 2005, p. 63. For discussion of the condemnation of some ideas of Thomas Aquinas by the Church in the 1270s, see S. L. Uckelman, 'Logic and the Condemnations of 1277', *Journal of Philosophical Logic*, vol. 39, no. 2, 2010, pp. 201-227. The limited circulation of university masters' work is discussed, for example, in C. Jones, 'Understanding Political Conceptions in the Later Middle Ages: The French Imperial Candidatures and the Idea of the Nation-State', *Viator* vol. 42, no. 2, 2011, p. 93. For a discussion of the unique intellectual milieu of the Parisian theologians, see I. P. Wei, *Intellectual Culture in Medieval Paris: Theologians and the University, c. 1100-1330*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2012, particularly pp. 87-169.

The reason for this diversity is the difference between different countries, the equal status of all the provinces and houses, and the excellent minds some people have. Different countries all have different customs, and out of this diversity different people have brought different things to the Order, even though it is only one Order.⁵

Humbert's tone suggests this state of affairs left something to be desired. After discussing the uniformity of other religious orders, he comments wistfully that 'it is with a certain sadness that we must realise how far we differ from the rest on this point'.⁶ Regardless of the Master-General's feelings on the matter, the reality remained that members of the thirteenth-century Order often had little in common with their brethren in far-flung provinces, and variation in levels of education and in appointments to episcopal or academic positions outside the monastery further exacerbated these differences.

The Order did, however, have a core mission of preaching and the salvation of souls, and an education system that provided the friars with a common knowledge base. These factors allow for the identification of distinctly Dominican influences on Martin's work, such as his concern for piety and orthodoxy and his metahistorical view of the role of the empire. At the same time, the Order was not the only determining factor in shaping the way Martin presented empire and emperorship: his position as a Bohemian working at the papal Curia also greatly informed his worldview and his assessment of imperial history.

Two of Martin's contemporaries, Vincent of Beauvais and James of Voragine, Dominican compilers who shared a common education and mission to produce reference texts for the edification of the Order and the wider community, offer points of comparison with Martin. Modern scholarship on all three friars has identified connections between them: they are often grouped together in discussions of thirteenth-century Dominican compilations,⁷ and the use of Vincent's *Speculum* by both Martin and James has been noted.⁸ However Vincent and James also, crucially, operated in different geographical and patronage circles to Martin: Vincent was a Frenchman writing for the royal court; James was a Genoese friar sympathetic

⁵ Humbert of Romans, *Super constitutiones*, trans. S. Tugwell, in Tugwell (ed.), *Early Dominicans*: p. 142.

⁶ Humbert of Romans, *Super constitutiones*, p. 141.

⁷ Mulchahey discusses the three texts as potential sources for preaching *exempla* within the Order: *Dominican Education*, pp. 465-472. Bert Roest also identifies the *Chronicon*, *Speculum*, and *Legenda* as salient examples of universal compilations written by mendicants: *Historiography of the Middle Ages*, pp. 295-310.

⁸ Ludwig Weiland identified the many points where Martin draws material from Vincent throughout his edition of the *Chronicon*, and Martin himself lists Vincent as one of his sources: *Chronicon*, p. 408. Both Le Goff and Epstein note Vincent as one of James's major sources for the *Legenda aurea*, particularly its brief 'Chronicle of the Lombards': Le Goff, *In Search of Sacred Time*, p. 171; Epstein, *Jacopo da Varagine*, p. 169.

to the city's rulers.⁹ Indeed, Elizabeth A. R. Brown's study of the concept of a '*reditus*' to the line of Charlemagne in the *Speculum historiale* is one key case study for the influence of Vincent's royal patronage on the way he presented particular ideas,¹⁰ and reveals the importance of considering the question of patronage with regard to Dominican compilations. The comparison of Martin's ideas of empire with those of Vincent and James reveals both the impact and limitation of Dominican influence, and the key roles played by ties of geography and patronage in each friar's presentation of imperial history.

This chapter explores the aspects of Martin's view of empire that can be traced to Dominican influence, such as the concept of the 'four monarchies' carried over from Peter Comestor's *Historia scholastica* and Martin's particular interest in emperors' orthodoxy and responsibility for the souls of the faithful. It will then contrast Martin's approach to imperial history with that of Vincent and James, establishing the importance of the empire and its role in Christendom according to each author. Case studies of prominent emperors such as Frederick II and Charlemagne will be used to compare each friar's treatment of imperial character and conduct. This comparison reveals that while some common ground exists between the three, the differences between their backgrounds and loyalties outside the Order had a significant effect on the way they perceive empire and the role of the emperor.

Dominican Influences on Martin

Martin of Opava entered the Order and was educated in the Dominican convent of Saint-Clement in Prague. It is unknown how long he was there but his connection to the monastery was strong enough that he later applied for papal privileges on its behalf.¹¹ He was probably reliant on the Dominican conventual school system for his whole education, as there is no record of him pursuing further study at one of the Order's provincial or general *studia* or joining the Order after attending university like a number of notable early Dominicans including Jordan of Saxony, Humbert of Romans, and Hugh of Saint-Cher.¹² Mulchahey's extensive study of Dominican convent schools sheds some light on the nature of Martin's education. Friars spent two years exclusively studying theology in the convent *scholae* before undertaking preaching

⁹ Jones highlights the differences in patronage between Vincent and Martin: *John of Paris*, pp. 90-91. There is no evidence that James's work was commissioned by or dedicated to any particular patron, though Epstein notes that 'he certainly wrote Genoa's history favoring the ruling elite', *Jacopo Da Varagine*, p. 171.

¹⁰ Brown, *Vincent de Beauvais*.

¹¹ Von den Brincken, *Verfasserlexikon*, p. 159.

¹² The Dominicans provided higher education in theology for their friars through *studia provincialia* and *studia generalia*; for an introduction to the former, see Mulchahey, *Dominican Education Before 1350*, pp. 219-220; for the latter, see Mulchahey, pp. 351-352.

or work in the community.¹³ The Dominican *schola* was ‘an early preoccupation of the Preachers and was already well developed by the middle of the thirteenth century’.¹⁴ The curriculum was based around two key texts, the Bible and the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard, with the *Historia scholastica* of Peter Comestor also occupying an important role.¹⁵

Martin shows a particular interest in the twelfth-century *Historia scholastica*. In the earliest recension of the *Chronicon*, he suggests that his work might be bound with the *Historia scholastica* by theologians and the *Decretum* or decretals by legal experts.¹⁶ The *Historia* is a work of biblical exegesis that ‘presents the history of salvation from beginning to end’.¹⁷ Clearly, Martin saw his *Chronicon* as fitting into and continuing the narrative of biblical history presented by Comestor, an authority explicitly endorsed by the Dominican Order. The final recension of the chronicle sees Martin drop the suggestion to bind his work with the *Historia*, instead appending to the prologue a brief account of the ‘four monarchies’ which echoes Comestor’s commentary on the prophecy of Daniel in the *Historia*. In this commentary, Comestor identifies the first kingdom – the ‘head of gold’ – as Babylon; the second as that of the Persians and Medes, ‘through which the kingdom of Babylon was destroyed’; the third kingdom – of bronze – as that of the Greeks; and the fourth as the empire of the Romans.¹⁸ This interpretation of Daniel’s prophecy, including the enduring nature of the Roman Empire, was first popularised by Jerome.¹⁹ Peter Wilson summarises the significance of the unbroken continuation of the Empire in medieval eschatology: ‘The Roman empire had to continue, since the appearance of a fifth monarchy would invalidate Daniel’s prophecy and contradict God’s plan’.²⁰ Martin’s adherence to the concept of the translation of empire indicates his belief that the Roman Empire had continued, unbroken, since antiquity and was therefore fulfilling Daniel’s prophecy.

There is, in addition, a wider ethos of conservatism and orthodoxy evident in Martin’s view of empire. While he intended the *Chronicon* to build upon Comestor’s vision of Christian

¹³ Mulchahey, *Dominican Education*, p. 133.

¹⁴ Mulchahey, p. 131.

¹⁵ The *Historia Scholastica* was ‘a constant presence’ in Dominican *scholae* by the early fourteenth century, and Humbert of Romans names it as a text that should be taught by *scholae* lectors in the mid-thirteenth century. See Mulchahey, pp. 137–138.

¹⁶ ‘Factum est autem eo compendiosus hoc opusculum, ut scholasticis hystoriis a theologis et a juris peritis decreto vel decretalibus convenienter possit alligari’, Martin of Opava, *Chronicon*, p. 397.

¹⁷ M. J. Clark, *The Making of the Historia Scholastica, 1150–1200*, Toronto, Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2015, p. xiii.

¹⁸ Peter Comestor, *Historia Scholastica*, ed. J. P. Migne, in *Patrologia Latina*, vol. 198, 1853, col. 1449.

¹⁹ P. D. King, ‘The barbarian kingdoms’, in Burns (ed.), *Cambridge History of Medieval Political Thought*, p. 125, and Allen, *Historiography in the Middle Ages*, pp. 25–26.

²⁰ Wilson, *Holy Roman Empire*, p. 38.

history, including the continuation of the Roman Empire as the fourth and final monarchy, Martin does not cite the *Historia scholastica* for this vision in the last recension. Instead, he borrows the description of the four monarchies from Orosius, which differs slightly from Comestor's commentary on the prophecy. According to Orosius, the four great kingdoms 'follow the four regions of the world, being Babylon in the east...Carthage in the south...Macedonia in the north...and Rome in the west'.²¹ The difference between the two is negligible as both name Rome as the fourth empire, but Martin is clearly appealing to the greater authority of the Church Fathers in constructing the foundations of his history. He takes further note of the fact that the account he cites of the four monarchies was not only written by Orosius, but addressed to Augustine.²² As discussed in previous chapters, Martin's vision of the emperor's role, particularly in relation to the two swords, also aligns with ideas put forward by the Church Fathers. As a member of a religious order whose mission centred on the promotion of orthodox doctrine, Martin's adherence to the teachings of the Fathers is unsurprising.

The mission of the Dominican Order manifests in Martin's *Chronicon* in another, less theoretical way. Chapter 1 established that the *Chronicon*'s treatment of individual emperors revealed a predominant concern with piety and, in particular, with the orthodoxy of Christian emperors' beliefs. The comments made by Martin on a ruler's piety – or lack thereof – are almost always accompanied by detail regarding the effect this piety had on the Church as a community. This reveals a chronicler whose treatment of the imperial office is as pastoral as it is political. The connection between Martin's concern with orthodoxy and his status as a Dominican is an easy one to draw: from its inception, the Order's preaching mission was linked to the need to combat heresy.²³ Whether or not Martin was ever deployed on preaching missions to convert heretics back to the faith is unclear, but the training he received at Saint-Clement would have equipped him to do so.²⁴ Such training is likely to have prompted Martin to comment on the heresy or orthodoxy of those tasked with universal temporal authority over Christendom. His inclusion of commentary on the impact of this heresy or orthodoxy on the community, however, points to a broader aspect of the Dominican mission: the care and

²¹ 'Reperiuntur autem inter alia regna 4 fuisse maiora secundum 4 climata mundi; videlicet Babilonicum ab oriente...Carthaginense a meridie...Macedonium a septentrione...Romanum ab occidente', Martin of Opava, p. 398, cf. Orosius, *Historiarum adversum paganos libri VII*, p. 35.

²² 'Sicut ergo dicit Orosius ad beatum Augustinum scribens', Martin of Opava, p. 398.

²³ On the Order's origins in Toulouse combating heresy see, for example, Lawrence, *The Friars*, pp. 65-71.

²⁴ For the Order's conventual *scholae* system and its role in preparing friars for their public ministry, see Mulchahey, *Dominican Education*, pp. 130-134.

concern for all souls. The salvation of souls was embedded into the foundations of the Dominican mission, appearing alongside preaching as the Order's driving purpose. The prologue to the Dominican *Constitutions* states that the Order 'is known to have been founded initially precisely for the sake of preaching and the salvation of souls, and all our concern should be primarily and passionately directed to this all-important goal'.²⁵ In his commentary on the prologue, Humbert of Romans, Master-General of the Order from 1254-1263, identifies this goal as distinct to the Dominicans: while other religious orders were concerned only with the salvation of those who entered the order, the Dominicans worked for the salvation of both the brothers and the wider public.²⁶ The interest Martin shows in detailing the effects of imperial piety on the spiritual lives of the Christian community as well as on the institutional Church is, perhaps, a reflection of the Dominican dedication to public ministry. This is not to suggest that other monastic chroniclers were indifferent to the affective relationship between the emperor and the faithful, but that it was simply not a priority for inclusion in their histories. Gilbert of Rome's near contemporary *Chronicon Pontificum et Imperatorum Romanorum* offers a point of comparison, one particularly valuable as he was one of Martin's sources. Despite the similarity in content and focus, Gilbert's chronicle does not include the same detail concerning imperial piety or its impact. While Constantine I's foundation of churches finds mention in Martin's entries of both the emperor and Pope Sylvester, Gilbert pays it no attention. Similarly, while Martin emphasises Charlemagne's acquisition of relics from the east and his foundation of churches, Gilbert makes no mention of either.²⁷ The heresy of the Byzantine iconoclasts, the focus of Martin's ire, barely registers in Gilbert's chronicle except for a brief comment that Leo removed and burned all the images – he does not even specify that the images in question belonged to the Church.²⁸

The Order's preaching mission also contributed to a scholastic environment that encouraged the production of reference works such as the *Chronicon*. Humbert of Romans stated that 'there are many histories, not only amongst the faithful, but even amongst the infidels, which are sometimes very effective for edification in preaching'.²⁹ Mulchahey categorises the *Chronicon* alongside the *Speculum maius* and the *Legenda aurea* as a work on

²⁵ 'Constitutions of the Friars Preachers', trans. Simon Tugwell, O.P., in Tugwell, (ed.), *Early Dominicans*, p. 457.

²⁶ Humbert of Romans, *Super constitutiones*, cited in Mulchahey, *Dominican Education*, p. 4.

²⁷ For Constantine and Sylvester, see Martin of Opava, *Chronicon*, pp. 415-416 and pp. 450-451, cf. Gilbert of Rome, *Chronicon*, p. 125; for Charlemagne, see Martin of Opava, pp. 461-462, cf. Gilbert of Rome, p. 130.

²⁸ 'Leo cum Constantino, filio suo, tempore utriusque Gregorii imperavit annis 25. Iste omnes ymagines, quas in Urbe reperit Constantinopolim asportavit ibique igne concremavit', Gilbert of Rome, *Chronicon*, p. 129.

²⁹ Humbert of Romans, *De eruditione praedicatorum*, 2.9, in *Opera II*, p. 401, cited in Mulchahey, p. 470.

the ‘borderlands’ of the *exemplum* genre which was mined by the brothers for use in sermons.³⁰ In addition to the deeds of popes and emperors, the *Chronicon* included ‘many anecdotes, and some out-and-out fables’, most of which Mulchahey suggests were ‘included by Martin specifically for the purpose of moral instruction’.³¹ In addition to his *Chronicon*, Martin was also the author of a collection of sermons, ‘conceived as a compendium of *exempla*’, which were helpfully indexed for use by his fellow preachers,³² and the *Margarita Decreti*, an index to Gratian’s *Decretum*. His writings reflect an interest in providing straightforward, practical resources for his Dominican brethren and for wider use in the Church. Consideration for their Order’s needs also factored into Vincent of Beauvais and James of Voragine’s compilation of, respectively, the *Speculum maius* and *Legenda aurea*. In the *Libellus apologeticus*, which serves as a prologue to the *Speculum maius*, Vincent makes a comment about his diverse sources: ‘examining these and many similar useful and delightful things in these histories, and seeing that our brothers were ignorant of many things of this sort, by diligent selection I have collected them and others like them from diverse authorities’.³³ He points out the particular value of ecclesiastical histories, which ‘have in some way become worthless and come into neglect, yet they may hold not only a spirit of enjoyment and of restoration but also much edification in themselves’.³⁴ Here, Vincent emphasises the didactic purpose of his compilation, which will furnish his own brothers as well as any other reader with these useful and edifying histories. James is less forthcoming with a statement of purpose for the *Legenda*, though the preface to one of his collections of sermons states that he only compiled them because his brothers had asked him to.³⁵ Epstein notes that James compiled the *Legenda* at the same time as he was composing his sermons, and ‘the motivation was probably the same: to help preachers’.³⁶ Le Goff also draws a connection between the Order’s preaching mission and its compilation of texts, commenting that the friars ‘made use of not only the spoken word to sanctify Christian society, but also – as Jacobus de Voragine himself illustrates – employed the

³⁰ Mulchahey, *Dominican Education*, pp. 465-472.

³¹ Mulchahey, p. 471.

³² Von den Brincken, *Encyclopedia of the Medieval Chronicle*, p. 1085; Mulchahey, *Dominican Education*, p. 462.

³³ ‘Hec et alia multa in illis historiis utilia simul ac delectabilia cernens, plurimosque fratrum nostrorum huiusmodi rerum ignaros esse conspiciens, ipsas etiam sicut et cetera de diversis actoribus diligenter excerptendo collegi...’ Vincent of Beauvais, *Libellus apologeticus*, ed. A. D. von den Brincken, in A. D. von den Brincken, ‘Geschichtsbetrachtung bei Vincenz von Beauvais: Die Apologia Actoris zum Speculum Maius’, *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters*, vol. 34, 1978, p. 467.

³⁴ ‘...inter hec autem historias ecclesiasticas...quodammodo viluisse et in neglectum venisse: cum tamen non solum utique voluptatis ac recreationis spiritus, verum etiam edificationis plurimum in se contineant’, Vincent of Beauvais, *Libellus apologeticus*, p. 466.

³⁵ Epstein, *Jacopo Da Varagine*, p. 15.

³⁶ Epstein, p. 66.

written word'.³⁷ The core mission of the Order was therefore a significant common factor behind Martin, Vincent, and James's decisions to compile their texts. The extent to which this corresponded to a common vision of imperial history, however, will be explored below.

The Importance of Empire

The empire itself occupies a major role in Vincent's *Speculum historiale* and the brief 'Chronicle of the Lombards' which appears at the end of James's *Legenda aurea*. The extent of the focus on imperial history in both works, however, reflects their authors' worldviews and the prominence of the empire in their own contexts. Neither James nor Vincent set out to write explicitly imperial histories. Vincent's intention in compiling the *Speculum* was to summarise all human knowledge in his time.³⁸ James's chronicle is, however, striking not only for the specificity of its aim but for how far it seems to have strayed from this aim. James introduces his topic as a follow-on from a brief comment on Pope Pelagius:

In the time of Pelagius I the Lombards came into Italy, and because many are proven to be ignorant of the history of these people, I have decided to insert their story here just as Paul, the historian of the Lombards, compiled it and as it has been explained in various chronicles.³⁹

Instead of a focused history of the Lombards, however, James's ensuing chronicle has been described by Steven Epstein as 'a long history essay' in which the compiler 'quickly summarizes western European history from the arrival of the Lombards in Italy to the empty imperial throne in the West'.⁴⁰ Alongside the actual recounting of the early history of the Lombards and a lengthy divergence into the origins and customs of Islam, James takes particular note of emperors. Epstein suggests that the inclusion of each emperor in the west from Charlemagne to Frederick II indicates that James hoped for a wide, pan-European audience for the *Legenda*.⁴¹ This potentially shows that in James's mind, the way for his history to appeal to and have relevance for a wider audience was to include coverage of Roman emperors as a universal focal point.

³⁷ Le Goff, *In Search of Sacred Time*, p. 5.

³⁸ Paulmier-Foucart and Lusignan, *Journal des savants*, p. 97.

³⁹ 'Tempore huius primi Pelagii Longobardi in Ytaliā venerunt et quia multi huiusmodi hystoriam ignorare probantur, ideo eam hic inserendam decrevi, prout in hystoria Longobardorum quam Paulus Longobardorum hystoriographus compilavit et in diversis chronicis explanata habetur', James of Voragine, *Legenda aurea*, vol. 2, ed. G. P. Maggioni, Florence, SISMEL – Edizioni del Galluzzo, 2007, p. 1408.

⁴⁰ Epstein, *Jacopo Da Varagine*, p. 165.

⁴¹ Epstein, p. 169.

This return to imperial history in a chronicle that is ostensibly not about the empire is notably different to the approach taken by Vincent of Beauvais, whose encyclopedic history grants similar levels of attention to the empire and to the kingdom of France. From its sixth book onward, ‘the *Speculum historiale* was structured around the reigns of Rome’s emperors and their medieval successors’,⁴² but within this structure the affairs of France are given similar coverage to those of the empire and, in moments of particular significance, even eclipse them. For example, in the twenty-seven chapters that span the reign of Anastasius, the deeds of the emperor himself are included in two, while four chapters are dedicated exclusively to the reign of the first Christian king of the Franks, Clovis, and his wife Clotild.⁴³ The following emperor, Justin, is discussed in two of the twenty chapters that span his reign, while the Merovingian kings appear in six.⁴⁴ Vincent’s use of Gregory of Tours’ *Historia Francorum* for much of this material shows that he was consciously seeking out exclusively French content for his chronicle. The reasons for this are obvious, given that Vincent was a Parisian friar under the patronage of King Louis IX,⁴⁵ though it serves as a useful point of comparison to Martin and James, who oriented their chronicles towards the universal powers of empire and papacy.

Martin pays little attention to the Franks prior to the Carolingians and is dismissive of them as soon as they pass out of the direct history of the Empire in the time of Louis III: ‘In his time the Italians began the imperial rule. For with the empire taken away from the Franks, it was brought to the Italians’.⁴⁶ He includes a discussion of Louis IX, but only as part of his chronological entries following the death of Frederick II, which he introduces by stating that ‘because many notable things have happened in various parts of the world in the time of this vacancy... I will explain them as briefly as I can’.⁴⁷ This may be explained in part by the focus of Martin’s work; there is no need for him to discuss France beyond the Carolingians. However, as Dan Embree has pointed out, a layout that allocated a number of lines for each entry that corresponded to the length of the emperor’s reign often resulted in Martin filling space with divergent anecdotes.⁴⁸ This suggests that, if he had deemed the affairs of other kingdoms

⁴² Paulmier-Foucart and Duchenne, *Vincent de Beauvais*, pp. 93-104, cited from Jones, *Medieval History Journal*, p. 323.

⁴³ See Vincent of Beauvais, *Speculum historiale*, book 21, ch. 1-27, pp. 818-827.

⁴⁴ See Vincent of Beauvais, book 21, ch. 29-49, pp. 827-834.

⁴⁵ For a discussion of Louis IX’s role in the production of the *Speculum historiale*, see Jones, *Eclipse of Empire*, pp. 38-40.

⁴⁶ ‘Istius tempore ceperunt Ytalici imperare. Exempto enim imperio a Francis, fertur ad Ytalicos’, Martin of Opava, *Chronicon*, p. 463.

⁴⁷ ‘Et quia plurima notabilia in diversis partibus mundi tempore huius vacacionis evenerunt...prout potero brevis, explicabo’, Martin of Opava, p. 472.

⁴⁸ Embree, *Chronicles of Rome*, p. 3.

worthy of comment, he would likely have had room to include them. James does not make a similar comment about the transfer of the empire from the Franks in the *Legenda*, but the kingdom makes no further appearance in his chronicle after the Carolingians except for a brief comment about Philip II's involvement in the Albigensian Crusade.⁴⁹ Chris Jones has juxtaposed the different outlooks of Vincent and Martin, noting that there is 'no place in Martin's vision of history for independent kingdoms' and that the two friars 'represented two very different ways of formulating world history'.⁵⁰ The approach taken by James, a friar contemporary to both Martin and Vincent but apparently free of obligations to any particular patron, may suggest that the 'Dominican' outlook skewed towards the traditional worldview of empire and papacy as the two universal powers. This aligns with the Order's overall commitment to orthodoxy and conservatism. Vincent's approach, however, also shows the extent to which external factors influenced a Dominican friar's presentation of Christian history.

The approach taken by each friar to the concept of the *translatio imperii*, however, does reveal a broader common understanding of the role the Roman Empire played in Christian history. Vincent, Martin, and James all include discussion of the *translatio imperii* from east to west at the time of Charlemagne's coronation, indicating a belief in the continual and unbroken history of the Roman Empire from antiquity. Vincent notes that Charlemagne was the first of the Franks to reign as Roman emperor, with 'the *imperium* of Rome separated from Constantinople after around 468 years had passed'.⁵¹ James includes a lengthy explanation of the translation of empire:

Therefore in the year 783, at the urging of the pope, having removed the imperial rule from Constantinople, the Romans unanimously granted imperial glory to Charles, crowned him emperor by the hand of [Pope] Leo, and called him Caesar and Augustus. After Constantine the Great the imperial seat had been at Constantinople, because the aforementioned Constantine left the Roman seat to the vicars of the blessed Peter and decreed the aforementioned city [Constantinople] to be his seat. Because of the dignity [of the title], emperors were called 'of

⁴⁹ 'Innocent tertius legatos ad Philippum regem Francorum misit ut terram Albigensium invaderet et hereticos deleret. Qui omnes capiens concremari fecit', James of Voragine, *Legenda aurea*, p. 1435. This comment seems to exaggerate Philip's involvement in the crusade, which was in reality very limited; the king sent his barons at papal request but did not join the effort himself: B. M. Kienzle, *Cistercians, Heresy and Crusade in Occitania, 1145-1229*, York, York Medieval Press, 2001, p. 152.

⁵⁰ Jones, *John of Paris*, p. 91.

⁵¹ 'Carolus igitur magnus...primus Francorum imperavit Romanis annis 13. coepit autem...diviso a Constantinopoli Imperio Romano evolutis annis circiter 468', Vincent of Beauvais, *Speculum historiale*, book 24, ch. 1, p. 962.

the Romans' until the time when the Roman Empire was translated to the kings of the Franks. Afterwards the former are called emperors of the Greeks or of Constantinople, while the latter are called emperors of the Romans.⁵²

Because his history begins well after the reign of Constantine, James includes a brief summary of the Donation of Constantine and thus provides a succinct explanation for how the Roman Empire has been transferred through cities and peoples, while remaining a continuous and unbroken institution. Martin is less direct concerning the *translatio*, though he notes that Charlemagne 'received the *imperium* of the Romans and reigned as emperor fourteen years, one month, and four days',⁵³ and includes mention of when the empire passed from the Franks to the Italians, and from the Italians to the Germans, to emphasise its continuity.⁵⁴ The belief in the transfer of the Roman Empire to different rulers was a popular aspect of contemporary thirteenth-century political thought, but it was also central to the interpretation of the 'four monarchies' theory that held that Rome was the fourth and final earthly empire.⁵⁵ Like Martin, Vincent and James would have come across this interpretation through Peter Comestor's *Historia scholastica* during their education at the Dominican *scholae*, though this is certainly not the only place they would have found it.

The way these three friars presented the role of the empire and its importance to Christian history in their texts varied considerably. Vincent's geographic background and royal patronage led him to give equal – and in some cases more – attention to the history of the French kingdom as the Roman Empire in his *Speculum historiale*. Meanwhile, despite James's stated purpose of chronicling the history of the Lombards in his chapter on 'Pope Pelagius' in the *Legenda aurea*, he kept a running catalogue of the western emperors and brief details of their reigns, indicating that he thought them important to any chronicle of Christian history. Both approaches are considerably different to Martin's chronicle, centred on the dual Roman

⁵² 'Romani igitur suadente papa anno domini DCCCLXXXIII [DCCLXXXIII] relicto imperio Constantinopolitano uni omnium consensu imperatorias laudes Karolo acclamant eumque per manum Leonis imperatorem coronant cesarem et augustum appellant. Post Constantinum enim magnum imperialis sedes apud Constantinopolim habebatur pro eo quod predictus Constantinus Romanam sedem vicariis beati Petri reliquit et apud predictam urbem sedem sibi ordinavit. Verumptamen propter dignitatem imperatores Romani nuncupati sunt usque ad illud tempus quo Romanum imperium ad reges Francorum translatus est. Postea vero illi Grecorum sive Constantinopolitani, isti vero Romanorum imperatores vocati sunt', James of Voragine, *Legenda aurea*, p. 1424.

⁵³ 'Karolus I. Magnus imperator accepit imperium Romanorum et imperavit annis 14, mense 1, diebus 4', Martin of Opava, *Chronicon*, p. 461.

⁵⁴ 'Exempto enim imperio a Francis, fertur ad Ytalicos secundum sententiam Romanorum...' Martin of Opava, p. 463; 'Exempto enim imperio Ytalicis, soli Theotonici imperaverunt usque ad presens tempus', p. 465.

⁵⁵ For a discussion of the development and popularity of the concept of *translatio imperii* and its significance for the four monarchies, see Wilson, *Holy Roman Empire*, pp. 38-40.

rule of papacy and empire. All three were in agreement, however, that the Roman empire had continued, unbroken, into their own time through a series of translations. This was a concept endorsed by the Dominican Order and taught in its conventual schools through the *Historia scholastica*, and appears as a common thread linking the three friars' understanding of the empire. Beyond this, the most important factors determining each friar's representation of imperial history lay outside the Order.

Virtue and Vice: Noteworthy Emperors

The differences in treatment of individual emperors' character and conduct between Martin, Vincent, and James again reveal differences in patronage and intended audience. This is perhaps most notable in each friar's account of Frederick II, the most recent emperor and a deeply controversial figure. Chapter 2 highlighted some key differences between Martin's and Vincent's coverage of Frederick's reign, particularly the way in which Martin restructured Vincent's material to make Frederick's crusade while an excommunicate appear to be the reason for his deposition. While James ultimately disapproves of Frederick, his assessment allows recognition of the emperor's positive deeds in a way that is markedly different to Martin's. James states that Frederick 'issued the best laws for the freedom of the Church and against heretics', and that he 'abounded in all riches and glory, but in his pride he abused them'.⁵⁶ The rest of his assessment is negative, but brief:

He made himself a tyrant against the church: he imprisoned two cardinals and had the prelates whom Gregory IX had called to a council captured, for which he was excommunicated by the same [Gregory]. Finally Gregory, overwhelmed by many tribulations, died, and Innocent IV, Genoese by birth, calling a council at Lyon, deposed the emperor. With him deposed and having died, the imperial throne is vacant to this day.⁵⁷

Apart from its brevity and mention of the emperor's good deeds, the *Legenda's* account of Frederick's reign differs from Martin's in some key respects. The *Chronicon* takes a great interest in Frederick's crusade as an excommunicate, emphasising its destructive impact. Instead of acknowledging the peaceful recovery of Jerusalem, it claims the emperor's crusade

⁵⁶ 'Leges optimas pro libertate ecclesiae et contra hereticos edidit. Hic super omnes divitiis et gloria abundavit, sed eis in superbia abusus fuit', James of Voragine, *Legenda aurea*, p. 1438. The 'very good laws' are presumably a reference to the Constitutions of Melfi: for a discussion of these laws as they pertained to the Church and to heresy see Abulafia, *Frederick II*, pp. 211-213.

⁵⁷ '...nam tyrannidem contra ecclesiam exercuit, duos cardinales vinculavit, prelatos quos Gregorius ix ad concilium convocaverat capi fecit et ideo ad ipso excommunicatur. Denique Gregorius multis tribulationibus pressus moritur et Innocentius IV natione Ianuensis concilium apud Lugdunum convocans ipsum imperatorem deposuit. Quo deposito et defuncto sedes imperii usque hodie vacat', James of Voragine, p. 1438.

brought ‘desolation’ to the Holy Land. James, meanwhile, makes no mention of the crusade at all or the related excommunications. Frederick committed offenses against the Church, but there is no sign of the ongoing defiance of papal authority that characterises Martin’s account. While James notes that Innocent IV was Genoese, he does not mention the city’s role in aiding the pope’s flight to Lyon, a detail included by Martin.⁵⁸ This appears to be a curious omission given that James himself was Genoese and in his chronicle of Genoa he credits the pope’s visit to the city on his way to Lyon with his own decision to join the Order of Preachers.⁵⁹ However, his overall account of Frederick’s reign in the *Legenda* suggests a chronicler attempting to remain neutral. This may be a further reflection of the hopes for a pan-European audience that Epstein suggests: James was reluctant to risk alienating readers who had been supportive of the emperor by condemning him too absolutely. Unlike Vincent, whose loyalties to king and country meant he included extensive detail about France in his work, James did not receive patronage from local elites for the *Legenda* and, therefore, had more freedom to write a work with universal appeal as opposed to one which celebrated the history of Genoa.

While neither the *Speculum* nor the *Legenda* present Frederick in a positive light, they are also notably free from the invective that characterises the *Chronicon*’s coverage of his reign. Additional comments in the *Chronicon* about Frederick that do not appear in either the *Speculum* or the *Legenda* include the emotive statement that he had treated the Church that had raised him like a stepmother and the accusation of filicide.⁶⁰ This difference may be attributed to the question of patronage: of the three, Martin was the only friar directly affiliated with the papacy, and his assessment reflects papal attitudes. Vincent and James were not under the same external pressure to condemn Frederick and, indeed, James appears to have made some attempt to avoid it by including positive aspects of the emperor’s reign.

The difference in treatment between Vincent and Martin of Pope Gregory VII and Emperor Henry IV during the Investiture Contest was highlighted in Chapter 2.⁶¹ The editing of Vincent’s material to show Gregory in a better light – and Henry in a worse one – further shows the impact Martin’s papal patronage had on his presentation of individual emperors when compared with his brethren. James’s treatment of Henry IV is, however, entirely different again: he almost completely ignores him. After noting Henry’s ascent to the imperial throne in 1057, James begins a catalogue of notable persons and events that are in no way related to the

⁵⁸ See Martin of Opava, *Chronicon*, p. 440.

⁵⁹ Epstein, *Jacopa da Varagine*, p. 256.

⁶⁰ For these comments see *Chronicon*, p. 471.

⁶¹ See pp. 58-59 above.

emperor, including a lengthy anecdote about Saint Nicholas's appearance to an abbot who refused to sing his new office.⁶² James includes detail about the pontificate of Gregory VII, including his conviction of a simoniac by miraculous means, but makes no mention of his conflict with the emperor.⁶³ Henry is only mentioned again at his death, where the chronicle notes his burial at Speyer with his ancestors.⁶⁴ James is, importantly, not writing an 'imperial' history. While he uses the chronology of empire as a framework for the chronicle, he is free to choose – as he often does – to skip over the details of a particular reign. Epstein notes James's tendency to switch emphasis during the reigns of emperors he disapproved of to 'papacies he thought significant', pointing out in particular the reigns of Henry VI and Frederick II, and his subsequent focus on the pontificates of Innocent III, Gregory IX, and Innocent IV.⁶⁵ James does, however, still include details on these emperors' transgressions; he passes over Henry IV's turbulent reign in silence. This seems a particularly curious omission given that, as Epstein points out, James 'understood the significance of the papacy of Gregory VII (1073-85) and his disputes with Emperor Henry IV' in his chronicle of Genoa.⁶⁶ His decision to skim over Henry's reign in the *Legenda*, therefore, may simply be a case of his not deeming the Investiture Contest relevant to his somewhat nebulous purpose. He may also, as with Frederick, have wanted to avoid any outright condemnation of a controversial emperor in a chronicle aimed at a wide audience.

Martin's treatment of papal-imperial conflict reveals a sustained and consistent interest in the rightful wielding of, and response to, papal authority. Vincent and James do not show the same interest in their coverage of two key emperors who clashed with the papacy. While both criticise Frederick II for his conduct towards the Church, they do not go to the same lengths to emphasise the emperor's rejection of the sentence of excommunication. While Vincent does criticise the emperor for undertaking a crusade while excommunicate,⁶⁷ James is particularly unconcerned with this topic. James's lack of interest in papal-imperial relations becomes clearer with his coverage of Henry IV's reign, which avoids mention of the emperor's activities entirely. Vincent discusses the Investiture Contest, but the reconciliation at Canossa, treated by Martin as the correct response to excommunication, is presented in the *Speculum* more as a papal scheme. There is, however, more common ground between the three friars with

⁶² James of Voragine, *Legenda aurea*, p. 1434.

⁶³ James of Voragine, p. 1434.

⁶⁴ James of Voragine, p. 1436.

⁶⁵ Epstein, *Jacopo Da Varagine*, pp. 169-170.

⁶⁶ Epstein, p. 242.

⁶⁷ Vincent of Beauvais, *Speculum historiale*, book 30, ch. 129, p. 1277.

regard to their treatment of imperial piety. All three note issues of heresy and the persecution of the Church by heretical rulers, though their interest in and coverage of acts of piety varies.

Chapter 1 highlighted the difference between Vincent and Martin regarding their treatment of Constantine's Arianism. Vincent presents the story of Constantine's Arian baptism as it appears in Jerome, and, although he expresses some doubts about the reliability of the story, he does not seek to refute it. Martin, by contrast, obscures the story's origin from Jerome by presenting it as a baseless rumour and refers to authorities who have proven it to be false. Vincent is less invested than Martin in proving the orthodoxy of Constantine, the cornerstone of Christian emperorship, but he does take a similar interest in noting the Arianism of other late antique rulers. He notes that, due to his 'Arian impiety', the emperor Constantius persecuted Athanasius and all other bishops not of the Arian sect.⁶⁸ At the beginning of his chapter on Valens, Vincent quotes Jerome's comment that 'in the third year of Valentinian's reign, his brother Valens, having been baptised by Eudoxius, bishop of the Arians, persecuted us'.⁶⁹ Like Martin, Vincent includes the detail not only of the emperors' heresy but their persecution of those of the Catholic faith. James's chronicle does not cover late antique or Byzantine emperors, though he does note that 'Theoderic, king of the Goths, ruled over Italy by command of the emperor and was corrupted by the Arian heresy'.⁷⁰ James leaves the reader in no doubt about his feelings towards Theoderic's heresy: he later includes the comment that, following the king's death, 'a certain holy hermit had a vision of Theoderic being plunged naked and barefoot into a fiery cauldron by Pope John and Symmachus, both of whom he had killed'.⁷¹ While not being an emperor himself, Theoderic is shown as ruling at the command of one, and the emperor is, therefore, implicated in both the heresy and the persecution.⁷² Similarly, in a divergent anecdote about the Ambrosian and Gregorian offices, James refers to

⁶⁸ 'Igitur secundo anno Constantii, impietas Ariana eiusdem Imperatoris fulta praesidio, exiliis, carceribus & variis afflictionum modis, primum Athanasium, deinde omnes non suae partis episcopos persecuta est', Vincent of Beauvais, *Speculum historiale*, book 14, ch. 4, p. 542.

⁶⁹ 'Anno 3. Valentiniani, Valens frater eius ab Eudoxio Arianorum episcopo baptizatus, nostros persequitur', Vincent of Beauvais, book 14, ch. 50, p. 559.

⁷⁰ '...Theodoricus rex Gothorum iussu imperatoris Ytaliam regeret et ariana heresi depravatus esset', James of Voragine, *Legenda aurea*, p. 1408.

⁷¹ 'Theodoricus autem subito defunctus a quodam sancto heremita visus est a Iohanne papa et Symmacho, quos ipse occiderat, nudus et discalceatus in ollam Vulcani demergi', James of Voragine, p. 1408.

⁷² Sources from the fifth and sixth centuries disagree regarding the extent of the emperor Zeno's involvement in Theoderic's reign in the west: see J. Moorhead, *Theoderic in Italy*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1992, pp. 17-19. For a discussion of Theoderic's Arianism see Moorhead, *Theoderic*, pp. 89-97.

a time when Ambrose ‘endured persecution by the empress Justina, who was corrupted by the Arian treachery’.⁷³

Vincent shares Martin’s treatment of Byzantine iconoclasm as the height of heresy; indeed, Vincent is Martin’s main source for the iconoclast emperors Leo III and Constantine V.⁷⁴ As with the Arians, Vincent leads his chapter on Constantine’s reign with a statement about his heresy. In this case, it is the same damning invective that Martin later uses almost word for word in the *Chronicon*: ‘This Constantine was the successor equally of his father’s empire and his impiety, the persecutor of the laws handed down by his forefathers, [and] for the whole time of his life gave his attention to evil magic, bloody sacrifices, and luxury’.⁷⁵ Martin takes his own assessment of Constantine one step further by comparing the emperor’s persecution to that of Diocletian, but he is certainly making good use of Vincent’s thorough condemnation of the iconoclast heresy. James’s focus on the west means that he avoids discussion of the great heresy of iconoclasm, and the iconoclast controversy plays no part in the transfer of empire from the Byzantines to the Carolingians in his account. In fact, Martin is the only one of the three friars to frame iconoclasm as a justification for the transfer of empire: Vincent includes the affairs of other kingdoms, particularly France, throughout the *Speculum historiale*, but he does not seem to have deliberately set up direct juxtapositions between the iconoclasts and the Carolingians. It is true that discussion of Charles Martel’s military accomplishments follows Vincent’s comment that Leo III had ordered the destruction of images, but this appears as a simple consequence of chronology. The chapter which addresses Leo’s iconoclasm is titled ‘Concerning certain other events that happened in his [Leo’s] time’, and also includes mention of various saints, the work of Bede, and the invasion of the Saracens.⁷⁶ Martin’s unique framing of iconoclasm as a justification for the transfer of empire reveals the extent to which questions of piety and conduct impact on his view of empire. Vincent and James share an interest in orthodoxy and condemn individual emperors who promote heresy, which is likely a reflection of their membership of an Order committed to the

⁷³ ‘Ambrosius namque...cum a Iustina imperatrice, ariana perfidia depravata, persecutionem pateretur’, James of Voragine, *Legenda aurea*, p. 1426.

⁷⁴ Weiland has indicated Martin’s use of Vincent for these entries: see *Chronicon*, pp. 459-460.

⁷⁵ ‘Hic Constantinus Imperii paterni, & impietatis pariter successor, legumque a patribus traditarum persecutor, omni vitae suae tempore magiciis maleficiis, & etiam cruentis sacrificiis & luxuriis operam dedit’, Vincent of Beauvais, *Speculum historiale*, book 23, ch. 151, p. 952. Cf. ‘Hic impietatum patrum successor legumque a patribus traditarum persecutor omni tempore vite sue maleficiis et magicis deserviens, luxuriis operam dedit’, Martin of Opava, *Chronicon*, p. 460.

⁷⁶ ‘Adhunc de quibusdam eventibus illius temporibus’, Vincent of Beauvais, *Speculum historiale*, book 23, ch. 149, p. 951.

suppression of heresy. They are not, however, constructing a particular vision of Christian emperorship to the same extent that Martin can be seen to do in the *Chronicon*.

The reign of Charlemagne is covered extensively by all three friars. While they all agree on his status as an exemplary Christian ruler, their treatment of his piety again reveals different priorities. Vincent was most likely Martin's source for the myth that Charlemagne embarked on a 'proto-crusade' to liberate the Holy Land. Vincent dedicates one chapter of the *Speculum* to the liberation of Jerusalem and another to the relics Charlemagne allegedly brought back from the east.⁷⁷ He also includes an account of the emperor's legendary expedition to Spain,⁷⁸ which does not appear in Martin's chronicle. Like the story of the emperor's liberation of Jerusalem, the myth of Charlemagne's conquest of Spain gained popularity in the twelfth century as a crusading narrative, though it developed from different sources to the Jerusalem legend.⁷⁹ Instead of including a mention of this Spanish expedition, Martin focuses the rest of his Charlemagne entry on the emperor's foundation and repair of churches and monasteries. While Vincent does not neglect similar accounts of the emperor's works,⁸⁰ he takes a greater interest in the apocryphal stories of Charlemagne's proto-crusades. Vincent's treatment of these proto-crusader narratives may, as Jones has suggested, be indicative of a French understanding of crusade as a particularly imperial activity.⁸¹ In these narratives, Charlemagne 'provided an example of what might be accomplished by a French king who obtained the imperial title'.⁸² Vincent's approach to Charlemagne's 'crusades' was a distinctly French one, unsurprisingly not shared by Martin. Instead, having included one narrative of Charlemagne's 'crusading' exploits, Martin moves on to the expressions of piety that interest him more. James, again, takes a rather different view. His image of Charlemagne focuses for the most part on the idea of the emperor as a defender of the Church. His conquest of the Lombards prior to his imperial coronation is framed in this way:

In his time Pope Hadrian presided over the see of Rome. He sent legates to Charlemagne seeking his help against Desiderius, king of the Lombards, who, in the manner of his father Aistulf, was greatly harrassing the church. Charles obediently gathered a great army and came

⁷⁷ See Vincent of Beauvais, *Speculum historiale*, book 24, ch. 3-4, pp. 963-964.

⁷⁸ Vincent of Beauvais, *Speculum historiale*, book 24, ch. 6-8, pp. 964-965.

⁷⁹ For a discussion of the development of the Spanish expedition story as a crusading narrative, see Stuckey, *Legend of Charlemagne*, pp. 137-152. While the Jerusalem story was popularised by the *Descriptio qualiter Karolus Magnus*, the Spanish expedition appeared in other sources such as the Pseudo-Turpin and the *Chanson de Roland*: Stuckey, pp. 138-140.

⁸⁰ See in particular Vincent of Beauvais, *Speculum historiale*, book 24, ch. 2, pp. 962-963.

⁸¹ Jones, *Medieval History Journal*, pp. 343-344.

⁸² Jones, *Medieval History Journal*, p. 344.

into Italy through Mount Cenis. He besieged the royal city of Pavia and there capturing Desiderius with his wife, sons, and the princes, sent them into exile in Gaul and restored to the church all the rights that the Lombards had taken away.⁸³

Later, James recounts the story that Pope Leo, having been attacked by a mob unhappy with his election, ‘took refuge with Charlemagne, who set him [back] in his see and punished the culprits’.⁸⁴ This particular act is followed immediately by Charlemagne’s imperial coronation. Here, James paints a clear picture of Charlemagne being honoured with the imperial title directly because of his protection of the pope.⁸⁵ These are not matters that his brothers were indifferent to: both Martin and Vincent include the deliverance of the Church from the Lombards.⁸⁶ Martin includes Charlemagne’s provision of refuge to Leo, although it appears in the papal section of his chronicle rather than the imperial;⁸⁷ Vincent provides this information in a chapter on events during the time of Empress Irene.⁸⁸ Within the limited coverage James provides of the emperor’s piety, however, the theme of *defensor ecclesiae* looms large. The final line of his account of Charlemagne’s life states, simply, that ‘he built many monasteries and when his praiseworthy life ended he made Christ the heir of all he had’.⁸⁹ There is no mention in the *Legenda* of Charlemagne’s mythical journeys to the east or Spain, or, subsequently, of Charlemagne’s acquisition of relics.

Vincent, Martin, and James all approached Charlemagne’s piety with a different focus. Vincent is the least selective of the three in his material, given his encyclopedic approach, but his inclusion of two separate ‘proto-crusader’ narratives from two separate traditions suggest a particular interest in this theme as an expression of imperial piety. Martin devotes considerable

⁸³ ‘...cuius tempore in Romana sede Adrianus pontifex presidebat. Qui ad Karolum magnum legatos misit postulans ab eo auxilium contra Desiderium regem Longobardorum qui more patris sui Astulphi ecclesiam plurimum infestabat. Cui Karolus obediens magno congregato exercitu per montem Cenisium Ytaliā intravit et Papiam civitatem regiam potenter obsedit et ibi Desiderium capiens cum uxore, filiis et principibus ad Gallias in exilium misit omnia iura ecclesie que Longobardos abstulerunt sibi restituit’, James of Voragine, *Legenda Aurea*, pp. 1422-1424.

⁸⁴ ‘Qui dum ad Karolum confugisset, ipse eum in sede sua collocavit et reos punivit’, James of Voragine, p. 1424.

⁸⁵ This can be contrasted with Vincent’s explanation, which is that the Roman people were unhappy with the rule of Empress Irene because she was a woman: ‘Romani qui ab Imperatore Constantinopolitano iam diu animo desciverant, nunc accepta occasionis oportunitate, quia mulier, excaecato Imperatore Constantino filio suo, eis imperabat...’, *Speculum historiale*, book 23, ch. 176, p. 961. Martin implies that Charlemagne’s coronation was the result of his defeat of the Lombards, following his summary of the conquest with ‘qui veniens Romam...ob rogatum Romanorum factus est imperator’, *Chronicon*, p. 461, as well as being further justified by the Eastern emperors’ iconoclast heresy.

⁸⁶ For Martin’s account: *Chronicon*, p. 461; for Vincent’s: *Speculum historiale*, book 23, ch. 169, pp. 958-959.

⁸⁷ See Martin of Opava, *Chronicon*, p. 461.

⁸⁸ Vincent of Beauvais, *Speculum historiale*, book 23, ch. 176, p. 961.

⁸⁹ ‘Cenobia multa construxit, laudabiliter vitam finivit et in fine rerum suarum Christum heredem fecit’, James of Voragine, *Legenda aurea*, p. 1426.

space to the description of relics acquired by Charlemagne, and the churches and monasteries founded or repaired by him: his focus, as discussed in Chapter 1, is on deeds that helped facilitate popular devotion. James is the most selective of the three, and his treatment of Charlemagne's piety has a clear focus on the emperor's protection of the Church.

The treatment of individual notable emperors in the *Chronicon*, *Speculum*, and *Legenda* highlights the differences between the three compilers. Martin's overly harsh assessment of Frederick II reveals the impact of his papal connections: neither Vincent nor James have such strong links with the papacy and their accounts of Frederick's reign do not feature the same invective against the emperor. In addition, James's approach to Frederick suggests a greater attempt at neutrality than either Martin or Vincent, possibly out of a desire to appeal to a wider audience. His omission of detail concerning Genoa's support of Innocent IV is a further example of this approach and perhaps also a reflection of his lack of local patronage: there was no need for him to emphasise the role of Genoa. Vincent, meanwhile, shows a distinctly French concern with crusade as an imperial activity in his inclusion of two proto-crusader narratives for Charlemagne in the *Speculum*. These differences in the treatment of imperial conduct can be attributed to geographic and patronage factors. The condemnation of heretical emperors does, however, appear as a common theme in all three works, and is a concern that can be easily linked to the Dominican Order's mission in suppressing heresy. In his treatment both of heresy and of imperial piety as a whole Martin emerges as distinctly concerned with the emperor's responsibility to the church. While Vincent and James are not indifferent to such matters, Martin pays particular attention to the impact of pious and impious emperors on the Christian community in a way that is not found in the works of his brethren.

* * *

There are several notably Dominican elements that can be identified in Martin's *Chronicon*. The concept of the ongoing Roman Empire as the final monarchy in the 'four monarchies' theory originating from exegesis of the book of Daniel, while not an exclusively Dominican idea, was one that Martin surely encountered during the course of his education at a Dominican *schola*. His assessment of the piety of individual emperors further reveal Dominican concerns and his interest in orthodoxy and heresy clearly reflects the functional mission of his Order. Meanwhile, his focus on the impact of imperial piety on the Church as a community of believers suggests a deeper engagement with Dominican pastoral ideals and the salvation of all souls. The extent to which these Dominican elements can be found in the presentation of

imperial history by his contemporary brethren is, however, limited. There is some common ground between Martin, Vincent of Beauvais, and James of Voragine: all three present the Roman Empire as a continual institution dating back into antiquity, suggesting that they follow the four monarchies theory. Like Martin, Vincent and James also take note of and condemn heretical rulers.

Nonetheless, Vincent and James's visions of empire and Christian emperorship vary considerably from Martin's. While Vincent uses imperial chronology to structure the *Speculum*, his extensive material on the history and affairs of France reveals a worldview in which the empire and France are placed at near equal importance – a significant departure from the centralised universal powers of papacy and empire depicted by Martin. Neither Vincent nor James take the same approach to papal-imperial conflict as Martin, who emphasises the emperor's response to excommunication as an expression of the pope's spiritual authority. Furthermore, Martin is considerably harsher in his invective against Frederick II than his brothers, who were not under papal patronage or employed by the Curia at the time of compiling their histories. The difference in each friar's concept of imperial piety, shown in their approaches to Charlemagne, further reveals the difference in their overall understanding of Christian emperorship. Vincent takes a particular interest in proto-crusader narratives, suggesting considerable influence by his royal patron, while James focuses on Charlemagne as a defender of the church. Martin's concern for the effect of imperial piety on the souls of all believers is not mirrored in the works of his brothers. The common view of empire between these three mid-thirteenth century Dominicans can be summarised as follows: the Roman Empire has continued from antiquity through a series of translations and it should not be ruled by a heretic. Beyond this, each friar's view of empire varies widely according to a number of factors including patronage beyond the Order, geographic background, understanding of the ideology of his Order, and the extent to which each engaged with these factors in his vision of empire. The *Chronicon* may be classified as one of many thirteenth-century Dominican compilations with shared attributes. It is also, however, an expression of the distinct vision of Martin of Opava, O. P., papal chaplain and penitentiary. This vision remained distinct in the early fourteenth century among Dominican chroniclers who employed the *Chronicon* in their own works.

Chapter 4: Continuity and Variation: Imperial Ideology in fourteenth-century Dominican Chronicles

The reception of Martin of Opava's *Chronicon* by his brethren offers a window into the nature of political ideas and the use of history within the Dominican Order in the early-fourteenth century. Among the later chroniclers and writers who drew heavily from the *Chronicon* for their own work were Ptolemy of Lucca and Bernard Gui. Both were prolific Dominican writers who produced a large and varied body of work, but their chronicles in particular – the *Annales* of Ptolemy of Lucca and the *Flores chronicorum* of Bernard Gui – draw heavily from Martin's *Chronicon* and present an opportunity for comparison between Martin's concept of empire and their own. The study of the reception of Martin's chronicle by these later chroniclers further allows Martin's ideas to be situated within the context of the late-medieval Dominican Order and to consider differences in the ways the empire was presented by Martin's contemporaries and by his early fourteenth-century successors. There are some elements of emperorship that find continuity across the works of Martin, Ptolemy, and Bernard, such as the requirement for emperors to receive papal benediction and the condemnation of Frederick II. However, the role of the emperor in Martin's worldview, where he is an essential half of joint papal-imperial rule of Christendom, does not carry over into the later work of his brothers.

The use of Martin's work by chroniclers within the Dominican order has not been examined before. However, the reception of chronicles more generally has attracted considerable scholarship, including studies of the works of Sigebert of Gembloux and Godfrey of Viterbo.¹ Work on the reception of Martin by other chroniclers has been focused on its influence either in a particular geographic region,² or on a particular genre.³ Chris Jones has considered the Dominican theologian John of Paris's use of histories written by members of his own order, namely Martin and Vincent of Beauvais,⁴ while Len Scales has looked at Martin's role in spreading particular ideas about empire throughout Germany.⁵ The following discussion, however, is the first exploration of the transmission of facts and ideas between

¹ Chazan, *L'Empire*; Foerster (ed.), *Godfrey of Viterbo and His Readers*.

² For scholarship that focuses on the reception of Martin by later English chroniclers see Matthews, *Medieval Literature and Civilization*, pp. 275-288; Embree, *The Chronicles of Rome*, pp. 1-28; and Ikas, *English Historical Review*, pp. 327-341.

³ For studies of Martin's influence on universal chronicles see Sprandel, *Historiography in the Middle Ages*, pp. 157-179, esp. pp. 157-160, and Roest, *Historiography in the Middle Ages*, pp. 277-315, esp. pp. 308-309. Roest's study does briefly acknowledge both Ptolemy of Lucca and Bernard Gui as Dominican successors of Martin, though his discussion is flawed by assuming Martin to be hierocratic.

⁴ Jones, *John of Paris*, pp. 77-118.

⁵ For some key examples, see Scales, *Shaping of German Identity*, pp. 276-290.

Martin's *Chronicon* and specifically Dominican chroniclers in different parts of Europe during the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries.

Ptolemy and Bernard, in addition to being Dominican chroniclers who made significant use of the *Chronicon*, were both active in the early fourteenth century at a time when the Order was becoming more established and cementing its loyalty to the pope in spiritual and political matters. This loyalty was made particularly clear during Pope John XXII's dispute with the Franciscans from the late 1310s through into the 1320s. The dispute saw the Dominicans side with the pope while the would-be emperor, Ludwig of Bavaria, offered support to the Franciscans.⁶ This not only carried implications for Dominican attitudes towards imperial power in this period, but also marked the point at which the Dominicans, while enjoying a close relationship with the papacy since their inception, could be singled out as the order most loyal to the authority of the Roman Church. The early fourteenth century has, furthermore, been identified as a period which saw a revival of hierocratic ideas in the face of both the practical collapse of papal authority and the further development of political theories that challenged the universal claims of both papacy and empire.⁷ The Dominicans, as they established themselves at the right hand of the papacy, were often proponents of these revived hierocratic ideas. This can be seen in a notable shift in the way chroniclers like Ptolemy and Bernard represented the balance of power between empire and papacy, moving away from Martin's vision of shared and equal power.

Both Ptolemy and Bernard were prolific writers who produced, among other works, a range of historiographical texts: Ptolemy wrote the *Annales* and the *Historia ecclesiastica nova*, his two main historical works, and included much historical material in his other writings.⁸ Bernard was the author of numerous historical compilations including the *Flores chronicorum*, the *Reges Francorum*, a compendium of saints' lives, and a number of local and order-specific histories.⁹ The *Annales* and the *Flores chronicorum*, however, represent the most universal outlook among each author's historiographical texts and give the most consideration to the empire, and are therefore the most suitable points of comparison with Martin's *Chronicon*. Ptolemy and Bernard share considerable common ground as Dominican chroniclers. In

⁶ For the religious origins of the dispute, see D. Burr, 'Effects of the Spiritual Franciscan Controversy on the Mendicant Ideal', in Prudlo (ed.), *Medieval Religious Mendicancies*, pp. 277-305, and for the political context, see P. Herde, 'From Adolf of Nassau to Lewis of Bavaria, 1292-1347', in M. Jones (ed.), *The New Cambridge Medieval History*, vol. 6, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2000, pp. 515-550, esp. pp. 538-543.

⁷ Canning, *Cambridge History of Medieval Political Thought*, pp. 363-365.

⁸ For a full survey of Ptolemy's works see Blythe, *Life and Works*, pp. 141-218.

⁹ For a survey of Bernard's works see Lamarrigue, *Bernard Gui*, pp. 47-55.

addition to their collective use of Martin's chronicle, there is evidence that Bernard consulted Ptolemy's other major historical work, the *Historia ecclesiastica nova*.¹⁰ This indicates a further layer of interaction between the friars and their texts, emphasising the interconnectedness of the Dominican historiographical tradition. Despite their similarities, Ptolemy and Bernard also represent two distinct political contexts: Ptolemy was from the autonomous Italian city-state of Lucca; Bernard from the south of France, based in Limoges and Toulouse. The lives and works of each have been the subject of considerable scholarship. Ptolemy was the author of numerous works of history, political thought, and biblical exegesis, including the completion of the *De regimine principum* begun by Thomas Aquinas.¹¹ Because of this, his political ideas, including those regarding empire and emperorship, have been the focus of considerable scholarship when compared with friars predominantly concerned with the writing of history. Most of this research has been done by James M. Blythe in two volumes dedicated to Ptolemy's life, works, worldview, and thought.¹² The existence of Ptolemy's treatises concerned primarily with papal-imperial relations and the role of the empire has meant that Blythe's studies of Ptolemy's worldview and political ideas have drawn primarily from texts such as *De regimine principum* and *De iurisdictione imperii*, with less attention given to the *Annales*.¹³ Meanwhile, Bernard Guenée provides a survey of Bernard's life, the state of the Church, and the political climate in which he lived.¹⁴ Studies of Bernard's works, including manuscript traditions, content, and approach, have been carried out by Léopold Delisle and Anne-Marie Lamarrigue.¹⁵ Scholarship on Bernard's extensive body of work is, to date, largely textual with little attention given to his political ideas.

This chapter will examine the way Ptolemy's *Annales* and Bernard's *Flores chronicorum* present imperial history and the role of the empire within Christendom. It will compare how each author approaches themes such as the prominence given to imperial history within each chronicle, the nature of the empire's relationship with the papacy, and the treatment of papal coronations and the imperial vacancy, to determine how the friars perceived the role

¹⁰ Anne-Marie Lamarrigue notes Bernard's use of the *Historia ecclesiastica nova* in his compilation of the *Flores chronicorum: Bernard Gui*, pp. 102-104.

¹¹ Blythe, *Life and Works*, p. xiii.

¹² Blythe, *Life and Works*, and *Worldview and Thought*.

¹³ Blythe discusses the dating and manuscript tradition of the *Annales* at length: *Life and Works*, pp. 191-194, and draws extensively from it for his biography of Ptolemy: *Life and Works*, pp. 31-135; there is, however, no detailed study of Ptolemy's ideas or presentation of history in the *Annales*.

¹⁴ B. Guenée, *Between Church and State: The Lives of Four French Prelates in the Late Middle Ages*, trans. A. Goldhammer, Chicago, Chicago University Press, 1991.

¹⁵ L. Delisle, 'Notice sur les manuscrits de Bernard Gui', *Notices et extraits des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque nationale et autres bibliothèques*, vol. 27, part 2, Paris, Imprimerie nationale, 1879, pp. 169-455; Lamarrigue, *Bernard Gui*.

of the empire. The presentation of empire as a whole by both chroniclers will be compared with that of Martin to show that, while there is some continuity of facts and ideas between the three brothers, the chroniclers' overall perspectives on the significance and authority of the empire varied according to external factors such as geographical background and patronage. Case studies of the ways each chronicler portrayed the character and conduct of controversial emperors further reveal the impact of these external factors. These comparisons allow for an exploration of the way later Dominican chroniclers engaged with Martin's material and the extent to which their own contexts prompted them to alter the worldview presented in the *Chronicon*.

The Place of Empire in the *Annales* and *Flores chronicorum*

Ptolemy of Lucca and Bernard Gui devote varying levels of attention to imperial history within their chronicles, which reflects the significance of the empire according to their individual worldviews. Ptolemy's *Annales* devotes a considerable amount of space to the affairs of the empire.¹⁶ His interests are essentially threefold, with the *Annales* recording papal, imperial, and Luccan history from 1063-1303. Being less restricted by space and format than Martin's, Ptolemy's accounts of imperial history are often far more detailed and note, in particular, any imperial privileges granted to the city of Lucca. Ptolemy outlines a range of subject matter in the prologue to the *Annales* including 'the deeds of princes and highest pontiffs or cities or castles through the succession of time'.¹⁷ While he devotes near-equal space to imperial and papal history in the *Annales*, he makes it clear that the two powers are not equal in importance or authority. The *Annales* begins 'from Pope Alexander II, who was previously bishop of Lucca, and from Henry, the emperor contemporary with him'.¹⁸ Ptolemy's choice of starting point for the *Annales* was most likely motivated by civic pride and the need to acknowledge a Luccan pope. In addition, Henry is introduced as the contemporary of Alexander, rather than a significant starting point in his own right. Ptolemy's explanation for the inception of the *Annales* reflects the focus and content of the chronicle itself: the affairs of empire and papacy are both discussed at length, though with a clear subordination of empire to

¹⁶ For an introduction to this text see O. Clavuo, 'Ptolemy of Lucca', in Dunphy (ed.), *Encyclopedia of the Medieval Chronicle*, vol. 2, pp. 1245-1246.

¹⁷ 'Quia igitur [memorara] gesta principum ac summarum pontificum sive civitatem sive castrorum per successionem temporis predicta continent...a ducentis solum quadriginta annis [vel circa] prefata gestam summemus...' Ptolemy of Lucca, *Annales*, ed. B. Schneider, MGH, SS. Rer. Germ. N.S., vol. 8, Berlin, 1930, p. 3.

¹⁸ '...incipientes ab Alexandro papa secundo, qui fuerat ante Lucanus episcopus, et ab Henrico eius contemporaneo imperatore', Ptolemy of Lucca, *Annales*, p. 3.

papacy. Beyond these two central powers, the city of Lucca is also a significant focus. Ptolemy's interest in imperial history likely reflects the significance of the empire in the affairs of Lucca. Many Italian city-states owed their allegiance to one of two rival factions, the Guelphs and Ghibellines, that may be loosely defined as pro-papal and pro-imperial respectively.¹⁹ By the time Ptolemy was writing in the early fourteenth century a large number of imperialist groups had been defeated and the Guelph city of Lucca, along with Pistoia and Florence, had further split into factions of Blacks and Whites.²⁰ The long association of dominant factions in Italy aligned with either the empire or the papacy suggests that the idea of these two great central powers loomed large in Ptolemy's experience and the way he conceived of the world around him.

Bernard takes a different approach than Ptolemy in his *Flores chronicorum*, a universal chronicle completed in various recensions between 1314 and 1331.²¹ While it was often accompanied by a brief papal-imperial chronicle,²² the *Flores* itself is structured around, and therefore prioritises, the history of the papacy. Bernard makes this focus and purpose clear in the prologue:

Wishing passionately to learn the names of the popes of Rome and the times in which they led the Church of Christ, and also the notable deeds and acts which happened in their times, I have often read books and works of many treatises, histories and chronicles, and the deeds and passions of the saints, in which the names and times of those popes are recorded, [and] I desire to discover more fully the certainty of truth in total and individually, especially because [of] great and excessive discrepancy and variety of times – the years, months and days – which I have found in diverse chronicles, and also of matters and deeds.²³

¹⁹ For a discussion of the Guelphs and Ghibellines, see, for example, D. Waley, *The Italian City-Republics*, 3rd edn., London, Longman, 1988, pp. 145-156.

²⁰ J. Lerner, *Italy in the Age of Dante and Petrarch: 1216-1380*, London, Longman, 1980, pp. 107-109. For Ptolemy's experience of the Black and White Guelphs, see Blythe, *Life and Works*, pp. 103-105.

²¹ R. Rech, 'Bernard Gui', in Dunphy (ed.), *Encyclopedia of the Medieval Chronicle*, vol. 1, p. 171. The modern edition follows three particular BnF manuscripts, listed as MSS. 4975, 4976, and 4977: *E floribus chronicorum, seu catalogo Romanorum pontificum, necnon e chronico regum Francorum, auctore Bernardo Guidonis, episcopo Lodovensi*, ed. J. D. Guigniaut and N. de Wailly, *RHGF*, vol. 21, Paris, Imprimerie impériale, 1855, p. 691. Delisle dates these MSS to 1321 (MS 4976), 1327 (MS 4977), and 1330 (4975): *Notices*, pp. 208-213. The edition notes where the MSS differ, which is predominantly in the later sections of the chronicle.

²² Bernard composed a brief papal-imperial chronicle for appending to either the *Flores chronicorum* or his collection of saints' lives, the *Speculum sanctorale*: Lamarigue, *Bernard Gui*, pp. 53-54. The content of these papal-imperial chronicles differs slightly between recensions, which will be discussed fully below.

²³ 'Romanorum pontificum nomina et tempora quibus Christi Ecclesiae praefuerunt, necnon insignia gesta et notabilia facta quae sub eorum temporibus evenerunt scire gestiens, plurium tractatorum, historiographorum et chronicorum saepe perlegi libros et opera, atque gesta passionisque sanctorum, in quibus ipsorum pontificum nomina et tempora saepius commemorantur, desiderans in cunctis et singulis veritatis certitudinem plenius invenire, praecipue propter multam ac nimiam dissonantiam varietatemque temporum quam reperi in diversis

Thus, the *Flores* is designed, according to Bernard, to correct the historical record. It is a product of his curiosity as an historian and his desire to know the ‘truth’ about the popes and their times. He has selected the ‘flowers’ or best parts of his diverse sources, which results in a universal history that puts the popes front and centre, relegating other institutions and individuals to supporting roles. The popes represent, to Bernard, the most important aspect of Christian history. This focus is highlighted in the last line of the prologue, where Bernard suggests his work be titled the *Flores chronicorum*, ‘or, if it is more pleasing to anyone, the Catalogue of Roman Popes’.²⁴

Bernard made extensive use of Martin’s *Chronicon* in the compilation of the *Flores*. His accounts of Frederick II and the popes who held the Holy See during his reign are often drawn from – and directly copy – Martin’s chronicle.²⁵ At the same time, the points where Bernard’s chronicle deviates from Martin’s are telling. Given his interest in the popes, it is unsurprising that Bernard draws predominantly from the papal section of the *Chronicon*, though he further reduces the mentions of Frederick when reproducing Martin’s material. This is most notable in his account of Pope Innocent IV’s retreat to Lyon, where he removes Martin’s discussion of the Council of Lyon and the deposition of Frederick entirely:

Pope Innocent, having made a great peace treaty with Emperor Frederick, while he considered the defiance of that man against the Church, fleeing Italy in secret, arrived at Lyon in Gaul by the help of the Genoese on Friday of the first week of Advent in the year of the Lord 1244. He was there continuously for more than six years, from the first week of Advent until the Wednesday before the Octave of Easter, after which he returned from Lyon.²⁶

chronicis annorum, mensium et dierum, necnon etiam rerum gestarum’, Bernard Gui, *Flores chronicorum*, p. 692. The editor does not note any differences between the MSS in this prologue.

²⁴ ‘...intitulari *Flores chronicorum*, vel si cui magis placuerit, *Catalogus Pontificum Romanorum*’, Bernard Gui, p. 693.

²⁵ Bernard is named as one of the authors who used Martin’s *Chronicon* by Weiland in his introduction to the MGH edition of the *Chronicon*, alongside Ptolemy of Lucca: p. 377. Bernard also made considerable use of Vincent of Beauvais in the *Flores* and, indeed, Rech names Vincent as Bernard’s main source: *Encyclopedia of the Medieval Chronicle*, p. 171. The modern edition of the *Flores*, however, only begins in 1227, meaning much of the material Bernard would have drawn from the *Speculum historiale* has been excluded. Martin is Bernard’s main source for the period 1250-1277, and Bernard also makes considerable use of Martin’s material for the reign of Frederick II.

²⁶ ‘Innocentius papa, post magnum tractatum de pace cum imperatore Frederico, dum ipsius adversus Ecclesiam contumaciam perpendisset, clam de Italia fugiens, Januensium auxilio advenit in Gallum, apud Lugdunum, quo intravit feria sexta in hebdomeda prima Adventus Domini, anno Domini M.CC. XLIII. Fuitque ibidem continue per sex annos et amplius, quantum est a prima hebdomeda Adventus usque ad quartum feriam infra octabas Paschae, qua recessit postmodum de Lugduno’, Bernard Gui, p. 696; cf. ‘Hic post magnum tractatum de pace sum imperatore dum ipsius adversus ecclesiam contumaciam perpendisset, clam Januensium auxilio devenit in Gallias, et celebrans concilium in Lugduno, ipsum velut hostem ecclesie condempnavit imperio privando...’ Martin of Opava, pp. 439-440.

Bernard's only mention of the deposition is a brief subordinate clause in the context of Innocent's support of subsequent imperial candidates.²⁷ He presents Frederick's character and actions in the same negative light as Martin, though the points where he differs from Martin's wording show him placing a lesser importance on the emperor. Bernard's entry on Gregory IX's pontificate is double the length of Martin's and devotes comparably less space to the affairs of the emperor and his conflicts with the pope.²⁸ Bernard's lack of interest in imperial history likely reflects the minimal role the Empire had come to play in the politics and worldview of southern France.²⁹

The subordination of imperial to papal power is a common thread throughout Ptolemy's earlier works. In his study of Ptolemy's political treatises, Blythe states that his view of the papal-imperial relationship 'fits comfortably into the papalist literature of this subject from the Investiture Controversy onward'.³⁰ The entire argument of *De iurisdictione imperii* in particular, one of Ptolemy's earliest treatises written around 1280, 'derives from hierocratic principles'.³¹ Blythe summarises Ptolemy's argument for papal power: 'since all lordship is from God, who disposes it as he sees fit, and especially to advance the end of salvation, then clearly the emperor had no independent authority'.³² His work does, however, acknowledge a partnership between papacy and empire that made the emperor unique among rulers, even if he was not equal in power to the pope.³³ In *De iurisdictione imperii*, Ptolemy uses historical precedent to illustrate the importance of the imperial coronation performed by the pope for the emperor to rightfully claim his title.³⁴ He concludes:

Therefore by these reasons and figures, prescribed and approved by custom, it can be concluded by legitimate persuasion that, except through the highest pontiff, in whose hands are all things

²⁷ See n. 54 below for quote.

²⁸ The *Chronicon*'s entry for Gregory IX is approximately eighteen lines in the modern edition, of which nine discuss his conflicts with Frederick; the *Flores*' account of Gregory is approximately thirty-eight lines in the edition, of which twelve discuss his conflicts with Frederick. Martin of Opava, *Chronicon*, p. 439, cf. Bernard Gui, *Flores*, pp. 694-695.

²⁹ Imperial influence in the south of France was significantly reduced from the second half of the thirteenth century as a result of Angevin and papal involvement in the region. On Charles I of Anjou's power in Provence see J. Dunbabin, *Charles I of Anjou: Power, Kingship and State-Making in Thirteenth-Century Europe*, London, Longman, 1998, pp. 41-54. For French perceptions of the limits of royal authority in the south see Jones, *Eclipse of Empire*, pp. 259-308. For papal possession of the Comtat-Venaissin see C. Jones, '...mais tot por le servise Deu? Philippe III le Hardi, Charles d'Anjou and the 1273/74 Imperial Candidature', *Viator*, vol. 34, 2003, pp. 208-228, particularly pp. 216-223.

³⁰ Blythe, *Worldview and Thought*, p. 97.

³¹ Blythe, p. 103.

³² Blythe, p. 103.

³³ For further discussion of the unique role of the emperor among secular rulers in Ptolemy's work, see Blythe, pp. 105-117.

³⁴ For a summary of Ptolemy's argument, see Blythe, p. 108.

of Christ in virtue, as is clear from the things already said above, and also as ordained by a new canon, the one elected as emperor legitimately can not legitimately administer the rights of the empire with the necessary confirmation through the taking up of the oath of fidelity, with the other unction and coronation by the vicar of Christ not following.³⁵

In this argument, Ptolemy justifies and articulates a view that appears unquestioningly in Martin's *Chronicon* and Bernard's *Flores*, as well as his own *Annales*: rulers of Germany who do not receive imperial benediction from the pope cannot be considered emperors. Both Ptolemy and Bernard vary in their use of titles for emperor-elects, with Ptolemy referring to Rudolf of Habsburg as 'king of the Romans and Germans', though he dropped 'Romans' from the title in both a later recension of the *Annales* and in his later work *Historia ecclesiastica nova*.³⁶ Bernard makes a comment that the Landgrave of Thuringia was 'king of the Teutons and Romans',³⁷ but refers to Rudolf of Habsburg as simply 'king of the Germans', following Ptolemy's use in the *Historia*.³⁸ The use of titles such as 'king of the Germans' and 'king of the Teutons' went against imperial convention, which maintained that rulers once elected were known as 'kings of the Romans', but was not uncommon among writers in France or those with pro-papal tendencies.³⁹

Ptolemy echoes Martin's accounts of German rulers who are not listed among the emperors because they did not receive imperial benediction. He explains that Henry V is so named because he was the fifth of the kings of Germany (*regum Alamannie*) named Henry, though he was only the fourth emperor because the first Henry did not receive the imperial benediction; this is the explanation given by Martin in his accounts of Henry I and II, whom he names as King Henry and Henry I respectively.⁴⁰ Like Martin, Ptolemy also comments that

³⁵ Ptolemy of Lucca, *De iurisdictione imperii*, cited in Blythe, p. 109.

³⁶ 'Rodulfus rex [Romanorum et] Alamannie moritur sine benedictione imperiali', Ptolemy of Lucca, p. 220; the editor, Bernhard Schneidler, notes that the later recension, B, drops 'Romanorum et' from the text, as does the *Historia*: 'Rodulfus rex Alamannie moritur...' Ptolemy of Lucca, *Historia ecclesiastica nova*, ed. L. Schmugge, MGH, SS, vol. 39, 2009, p. 632.

³⁷ '...regis Theutoniae et Romanorum...' Bernard Gui, *Flores chronicorum*, p. 696.

³⁸ 'Rodulphus, rex Alamannie, moritur sine benedictione imperiali', Bernard Gui, p. 709; c.f. *Historia* in n. 36 above. It is likely that Ptolemy's *Historia* – and in particular its later recension – was Bernard's source for this comment. Bernard also refers to Rudolf's coronation 'in regem Alamannie et Romanorum', as Jones notes: *Eclipse of Empire*, p. 314.

³⁹ For a full discussion of the use of these titles in a French context, including Bernard Gui's use of them, see Jones, *Eclipse of Empire*, pp. 313-315.

⁴⁰ '...Henrico filio, qui quintus est in genealogia regum Alamannie, sed est quartus in genealogia imperatorum, quia primus Henricus benedictionem imperialem non est consecutus, ut Martinus refert et Gottifredus', Ptolemy of Lucca, p. 27; cf. 'Henricus rex...unde nec ipse inter imperatores computatur, quia non regnavit in Ytalia nec fuit per papam coronatus', and 'Henricus I...nota quod plures sunt Henrici reges quam Henrici imperatores. Unde cum legitur Henricus primus ratione imperii dicitur primus, sed ratione nominis secundus dicitur', Martin of Opava, pp. 464-466. While Ptolemy cites Godfrey of Viterbo as well as Martin for the numbering of the Henrys, there is no evidence that he accessed Godfrey's *Pantheon* directly: Schneidler does not include Godfrey

Conrad II did not receive imperial benediction, ‘from which he is not counted in the catalogue of emperors’.⁴¹ Both Ptolemy and Bernard draw from Martin in their coverage of the landgrave of Thuringia and William of Holland, the elected rulers of Germany, both of whom died before receiving benediction during the imperial vacancy. Bernard states that they ‘came to the end of their lives before they reached the imperial benediction’,⁴² while Ptolemy recounts their deaths and notes that ‘thus each lacked imperial benediction’.⁴³ Moving on from the material available in Martin’s chronicle, Ptolemy and Bernard both make the same point about Rudolf of Habsburg, who ‘died without imperial benediction’.⁴⁴

Ptolemy also includes more blatant statements concerning papal and imperial authority within the *Annales*. In his account of Frederick II’s conflict with the papacy, and in particular the emperor’s unsatisfactory peace treaty, Ptolemy states:

From this Pope Innocent was compelled to make a defence against Frederick, showing in it that the jurisdiction of the pope over Christianity is greater than the imperial jurisdiction, confirming this himself through the sentences of his predecessors and especially Innocent III, which we have in the decretal, *Venerabilem*.⁴⁵

An earlier recension of the *Annales* puts this more succinctly, referring to the greater dignity of the pope rather than the greater jurisdiction.⁴⁶ The move from discussing the greater dignity of the papacy to the pope’s greater jurisdiction suggests that Ptolemy was seeking to strengthen his point about papal power in later recensions of the chronicle.

When compared to Ptolemy, Bernard has little to say directly about the relationship between papacy and empire. He subscribes to the belief that an emperor is only made legitimate by papal coronation, but he makes no overt statements about the nature of imperial power. It is

in Ptolemy’s list of likely sources for the *Annales*: (pp. xxi-xxxi). Weiland suggests that Martin himself took this information from Godfrey via Gilbert of Rome: *Chronicon*, p. 466, n. 74.

⁴¹ ‘Huic succedit Curadus, qui...benedictionem tamen imperialem non habuit; unde et in cathalogo imperatorum non computatur’, Ptolemy of Lucca, p. 52; cf. ‘Qui licet 15 annis regnaverat, benedictionem tamen imperialem non habuit’, Martin of Opava, p. 469.

⁴² ‘Praefati ergo duo, antequam ad benedictionem imperialem pervenissent, vitae terminum exegerunt’, Bernard Gui, p. 696, cf. ‘...videlicet lanteravium Thuringie et comitem Hollandie successive, qui antequam ad imperialem benedictionem pervenisset, vite terminum exegerunt’, Martin of Opava, p. 472.

⁴³ ‘...et sic uterque caruit benedictione imperiali’, Ptolemy of Lucca, p. 127; cf. ‘et sic uterque electus caruit benedictione imperiali’, Martin of Opava, p. 471.

⁴⁴ See n. 36 above for Ptolemy of Lucca’s quote and n. 38 above for Bernard Gui.

⁴⁵ ‘Unde coactus est papa Innocentius contra Fredericum apologeticum facere, ostendens in eo iurisdictionem pape super Christianitatem esse maiorem iurisdictione imperiale, confirmans hoc ipsum per sententias suorum antecessorum et precipue Innocentii tertii, quam habemus in decretali Extra. De electione. Venerabilem’, Ptolemy of Lucca, *Annales*, p. 125.

⁴⁶ ‘1241 papa Innocentius 4. ostendit Federico imperatori pontificiam dignitatem imperiali esse maiorem’, *Annales*, p. 125; Schneider notes this is the only information for 1241 in Recension A.

clear, however, that he does not share the view that the empire holds a vital, if subordinate, share in the universal rule of Christendom. The prologue to one of his brief supplementary papal-imperial chronicles, appended to the *Speculum sanctorale*, reveals its purpose as an aid in dating the lives of the saints, because ‘the times and years of the saintly martyrs, confessors and virgins, in which they flourished and migrated from this life to the Lord, are more often marked out in their *gestae* through the times and years of the emperors and popes of Rome’.⁴⁷ Here, Bernard suggests that his composition of an imperial chronicle is not due to any great importance of the history of the empire, but rather the tendency of hagiography to date the lives of saints to the ruling pope and emperor.

Ptolemy and Bernard’s treatment of the imperial vacancy further reveals their interest in imperial history and how they perceive the empire’s importance. Ptolemy shows an ongoing interest in the vacant empire, though, unlike Martin, he does not explicitly identify it with the end of Frederick II’s reign. Indeed, Ptolemy’s account of Frederick’s reign shows a more curious omission, given his usual interest in imperial affairs: he makes no mention of the emperor’s deposition. He notes that Pope Innocent called a council of the prelates against Frederick, which he dates to 1242,⁴⁸ and that the German princes elected the landgrave of Thuringia on Innocent’s orders in 1244.⁴⁹ It is possible that Ptolemy simply forgot to mention the deposition or took it as read since he includes it in his later *Historia ecclesiastica nova*.⁵⁰ In the *Annales*, he notes the German electors’ inability to agree on a candidate during the interregnum:

...They were divided in two parts, because one part elected the king of Castile, the lord Alfonso [X], [and] the other elected the lord Richard, earl of Cornwall and brother of the king of England, and the dispute remained for many years and did not end except through the death of one of them, on account of which dispute infinite money was indeed spent.⁵¹

⁴⁷ ‘Quoniam sanctorum martirum et confessorum ac virginum tempora et anni in quibus floruerunt et de hac vita ad Dominum migraverunt, in gestis istorum sepius designantur per tempora et annos imperatorum et pontificum Romanorum’, Bernard Gui, ‘Préface de la dernière édition de la chronique abrégée des papes et des empereurs’, ed. Delisle, in Delisle, *Notices*, p. 425.

⁴⁸ Ptolemy of Lucca, pp. 125-126.

⁴⁹ He notes that ‘others say the council was held in ’45; and the election mandated in the same year’ (‘Alii dicunt concilium celebratum in XLV; et eodem anno mandata fuit electio’), Ptolemy of Lucca, p. 127.

⁵⁰ ‘In processu autem concilii, hoc est XVI. kal. augusti, Innocentius Fredericum imperatorem Romanum velut hostem ecclesie condemnavit ipsumque tam ab imperio quam a regno Sicilie, Apulie et Calabrie deposuit...’ Ptolemy of Lucca, *Historia ecclesiastica nova*, p. 548.

⁵¹ ‘Principes Alamannie imperatoris electores ad electionem conveniunt, divis eruntque se in duas partes, quia una pars elegit regem Castelle dominum Alfonsum, alia vero dominum Ricciardum comitem Cornubie et fratrem regis Anglie elegit, que questio duravit multis annis nec terminata fuit nisi per mortem utriusque, pro qua quidem questione infinita pecunia est expensa’, Ptolemy of Lucca, *Annales*, p. 137.

Ptolemy shows a continued interest in the affairs of the empire and explains the reasons behind the imperial vacancy, from the death of candidates before benediction to the electors' inability to agree on a candidate in the first place, despite not explicitly identifying the vacancy. Bernard Gui, while including Ptolemy's comment about Rudolf of Habsburg's lack of imperial benediction, does not mention the dispute between German electors that caused the lengthy interregnum. The *Annales* concludes before the election and coronation of Henry VII, but Ptolemy includes coverage of both in his *Historia*.⁵² While Ptolemy's coverage of the events and causes of the imperial vacancy is similar to Martin's, the lack of explicit identification of the vacancy is notable: for Martin, the absence of an emperor was a serious disruption to the way Christendom ought to be ruled and Frederick's death marked the beginning of a new era of vacancy. Ptolemy's interest in the affairs of the empire appears similar to Martin's, but it is not motivated by the same conviction that the empire is an essential counterpart to the papacy in the rule of Christendom.

Bernard Gui's lack of interest in the affairs of the empire extends to his treatment of the imperial vacancy. While he borrows phrasing from Martin in his discussion of Pope Innocent's support of imperial candidates, Bernard avoids any reference to the vacancy which frames Martin's discussion of the candidates. Martin introduces the topic with 'the Roman empire has been vacant since either the deposition of Frederick II or after his death', and concludes with 'this split has continued for many years until the present day'.⁵³ Bernard leaves out both of these references to a vacancy in his summary of the candidates:

Pope Innocent, after he had deposed Frederick from the empire, supported the landgrave of Thuringia, elected by the electors as king of the Teutons and Romans, against the deposed Frederick; he died less than four years later. Then William, count of Holland was elected, who was killed in battle by the Friesians in the fifth year following. Therefore both the aforementioned, before they reached the imperial benediction, came to the end of their lives.⁵⁴

⁵² See Ptolemy of Lucca, *Historia*, pp. 665-672.

⁵³ See n. 54 below for full quote. For Vincent of Beauvais's use of the concept of an imperial vacancy, see Chazan, *L'Empire*, pp. 678-679.

⁵⁴ 'Innocentius vero papa, postquam deposuerat ab Imperio Fredericum, procuravit per electores regis Theutoniae et Romanorum eligi langravium Turingiae contra depositum Fredericum; qui infra quatuor annos moritur. Dehinc eligitur Guillelmus, comes Hollandiae, qui, anno quinto post, in bello a Frisonibus est occisus. Praefati ergo duo, antequam ad benedictionem imperialem pervenissent, vitae terminum exegerunt', Bernard Gui, *Flores chronicorum*, p. 696; cf. 'Romanum imperium sive post deposicionem Friderici II. ab imperio, sive post mortem eius cepit vacare. Nam post deposicionem ipsius papa Innocentius IV, qui eum deposuerat, procuravit per principes Alamannie electores plures eligi ad imperium, videlicet lantravium Thuringie et comitem Hollandie successive, qui antequam ad imperialem benedictionem pervenissent, vite terminum exegerunt...Quod scisma multis annis et usque hodie perseverat', Martin of Opava, *Chronicon*, p. 472.

This omission may be attributed to the fact that the vacancy had ended by the time Bernard compiled the *Flores*; however, it also suggests that he considered the lack of an emperor to be of little consequence. Equally unimportant to Bernard was the coronation of Henry VII that brought an end to the vacancy. Bernard records Henry's election as King of the Germans in 1309 and Pope Clement V's subsequent confirmation of his election and promise of an imperial coronation two years later.⁵⁵ He then briefly acknowledges Henry's arrival in Italy for his imperial benediction and his coronation as King of the Lombards.⁵⁶ After this, Bernard makes no further mention of Henry; even his imperial coronation in 1312 is left out of the *Flores*, and he is never acknowledged as emperor. Jones suggests that the limited coverage of Henry's reign may have been a deliberate attempt by Bernard to avoid passing judgement on a controversial figure who quarrelled with the papacy but seemed to have the support of the French crown.⁵⁷ However, Bernard's dismissive treatment of Henry VII is also clearly in line with his approach to the empire throughout the *Flores*: he clearly sees little need to mention whether or not the empire had a ruler at any given time. Henry's coronation is also, notably, too late for inclusion in Bernard's sources – such as Martin, Vincent, and even Ptolemy – who show a greater interest in imperial history than Bernard himself. This may suggest that without their influence, Bernard was less inclined to mention even landmark events in imperial history such as Henry's coronation and the end of the imperial vacancy.

While their levels of interest in the imperial vacancy differ, Bernard and Ptolemy, like Martin, both acknowledge the continued existence of the empire during the vacancy. This can be contrasted with the early fourteenth-century theologian John of Saint-Victor, who claimed that the empire had ceased to exist by his time.⁵⁸ Jones has drawn a comparison between the ideas of John of Saint-Victor and his contemporary and colleague in Theology at the University of Paris, the Dominican John of Paris, who seems to support an ongoing and unique role for the Roman Empire.⁵⁹ Jones suggests that the unusual importance given to the empire in John of Paris's *De potestate regia et papali* is the result of Dominican influence.⁶⁰ There is certainly an identifiable common thread between Dominican writers regarding the continued significance of the Roman Empire, particularly when taking into account an education derived

⁵⁵ See Bernard Gui, pp. 718-719.

⁵⁶ Bernard Gui, p. 720.

⁵⁷ Jones, *Eclipse of Empire*, pp. 140-141.

⁵⁸ Jones, *John of Paris*, pp. 80-81.

⁵⁹ Jones, *John of Paris*, pp. 80-81.

⁶⁰ Jones, *John of Paris*, p. 110.

from traditional sources;⁶¹ however, the extent to which each writer subscribes to this worldview varies. Ptolemy's work reveals a clear adherence to the idea of two central universal powers, though his belief that the empire is always subservient to and dependent upon the papacy is equally evident. Bernard's worldview is centred around the papacy, with imperial affairs only included in his chronicle as reference points or carried over from material by writers more interested in the empire than himself. Both these approaches show a shift away from Martin's idea of empire. While the three friars are in agreement concerning the continued existence of the empire and the need for papal benediction to legitimise imperial authority, Bernard and Ptolemy's chronicles present the empire as a power distinctly reduced in significance and authority when compared with Martin's vision of joint papal-imperial rule of Christendom.

Departure from Martin's Vision of Emperorship

Alongside the 'big picture' questions about the role of the empire in each friar's worldview, the *Annales* and the *Flores*, like the *Chronicon*, reveal much about the standards of conduct and rulership their authors applied to individual emperors. Ptolemy's presentation of bad emperorship, exemplified in the reigns of Otto IV and Frederick II, further emphasise his hierocratic understanding of papal-imperial relations and highlight the differences between his concept of emperorship and Martin's. Bernard's presentation of the reigns of Frederick II, Henry VII, and Ludwig of Bavaria, however, reveal inconsistencies in his treatment of the imperial office. His coverage of papal-imperial conflict and excommunication, in particular, varies according to the potential audience for his work. Both Ptolemy and Bernard's treatment of individual emperors show a marked departure from Martin's consistent, developed vision of the imperial office as an essential counterpart to the papacy.

Ptolemy is very deliberate in using examples of individual emperors to make statements about the imperial office. Blythe highlights Ptolemy's use of exemplars in the *De iurisdictione imperii*, which shows that 'the three emperors most devoted to God and subject to the church', namely Constantine, Justinian, and Charlemagne, 'died peacefully in their old age and were victorious above all others', while Julian the Apostate, Otto IV, and Frederick II, 'the arch-persecutors', died miserably at a young age.⁶² The *Annales* covers the reigns of two of these

⁶¹ For a further discussion of Dominican writers' adherence to the idea of an enduring empire, see Jones, *John of Paris*, pp. 107-110; the idea of empire in Peter Comestor's *Historia scholastica*, a key text in Dominican education, is discussed in Chapter 3 of this thesis.

⁶² Blythe, *Worldview and Thought*, p. 106, cf. Ptolemy of Lucca, *De iurisdictione imperii*, ed. M. Krammer, MGH, *Fontes iuris*, vol. 1, Hannover, 1909, pp. 14-15.

emperors, Otto IV and Frederick II, and emphasises in particular their denial of, or disrespect for, the Church's authority. Ptolemy is blunt in his discussion of Otto, who 'entered the kingdom of Apulia and took it from Frederick, then still a boy, against the will of lord Innocent, as Martin writes; on account of this he [Innocent] excommunicated him and deposed him from the empire'.⁶³ Ptolemy's account of events echoes a line from Martin's entry for Otto, with the addition of the phrase 'et ad imperio deponit'.⁶⁴ Martin mentions in the papal section that Innocent III 'crowned and deposed Otto'.⁶⁵ Ptolemy's combination of material from two different sections of the *Chronicon* indicates that he was deliberately seeking to include both Otto's violation of papal instructions and the specific consequence of doing so: deposition. His comments about Frederick similarly emphasise the emperor's disobedience, including that in 1221 'Frederick began to disturb the Church; he was advised by the Church, which warned him of his offences, but did not obey; but the Church still tolerated [him]'.⁶⁶ He goes on to say that in 1222, Frederick:

still persevering in his defiance concerning the orders of the Church, considering the Church, which raised him as a son and cherished him in particular from infancy, and turning against it, destroyed the Church as if it were a stepmother, and was excommunicated by Honorius as an ingrate; and as the reward for his ingratitude [Honorius] deposed him from the empire, as Martin writes, and absolved all the barons from their oaths of fidelity.⁶⁷

While Ptolemy cites Martin for this information, there are some key differences between the accounts. Martin does not make particular mention of Frederick's ongoing failure to obey the Church at this point, and while he includes the emperor's excommunication and the absolution of the barons from their oaths of fidelity, he does not include the comment that Honorius

⁶³ 'Octo imperator intrat regnum Apulie et aufert Frederico adhuc puero contra voluntatem domini Innocentii, ut scribit Martinus; quam ob causam ipsum excommunicat et ab imperio deponit', Ptolemy of Lucca, *Annales*, p. 98.

⁶⁴ Cf. 'Hic accepta corona statim pugnam habuit cum Romanis, et contra voluntatem domni pape intravit regnum Apulie, auferens illud Frederico regi Sycilie, unde papa excommunicavit illum', Martin of Opava, *Chronicon*, p. 471.

⁶⁵ 'Hic etiam coronavit Ottonem et deposuit, quia non servavit fidelitatem', Martin of Opava, *Chronicon*, p. 437. This statement is very vague concerning the reasons for Otto's deposition, which may explain why Ptolemy chose to take the majority of his detail from the imperial section.

⁶⁶ 'Eodem anno incipit Fredericus ecclesiam perturbare; monetur ab ecclesia, quod caveat de offensa, sed non obedit; sed adhuc ecclesia tollerat', Ptolemy of Lucca, p. 109.

⁶⁷ 'Eodem anno Fredericus adhuc perseverans in sua contumacia circha ecclesie mandata, considerans ecclesia, quod ipsum nutrit tamquam filium et sicut pecularem ab infancia fovit, ut hystorie tradunt et superius aliquid est dictum, ipse vero ecclesiam tamquam novercam adversans laniat ab Honorio sicut ingratus excommunicatur, et propter merita ingratitudinis ipsum ab imperio deponit, ut Martinus scribit, et omnes barones a iuramento fidelitatis absolvit', Ptolemy of Lucca, p. 111.

‘deposed him from the empire’.⁶⁸ Ptolemy adds a further mention of deposition in the *Annales*, this time in 1227:

In the same year Pope Gregory, hoping that Frederick would return to the bosom of the Church, delayed renewing the sentence against him, but after seeing [him] scorn the kindness of God, in the following year struck against him and confirmed the sentence of Honorius as far as excommunication and deposition from the imperial dignity.⁶⁹

In the way that he approaches Otto and Frederick, Ptolemy emphasises two factors in the emperors’ conflict with the Church: their failure to respect the Church’s authority, and the Church’s ability to strip them of their power in response. The *Annales* makes a clear point of the emperor’s claims to power being reliant on the approval of the pope, particularly through the addition of the language of deposition to existing mentions of the emperor’s excommunication. While the excommunication and the absolution of the barons’ oaths of fealty may have had the same practical impact as deposition on the emperor’s power, it is notable that the chroniclers Ptolemy accessed used the word ‘deposed’ only in reference to the 1245 Council of Lyon deposition.⁷⁰ Even Ptolemy’s *Historia* refers only to 1245 when discussing deposition.⁷¹ His choice of words in the *Annales* is, therefore, a very deliberate one that emphasises papal authority over empire. The *Annales* condemns Frederick for his ingratitude and defiance of the Church while also leaving the reader in no doubt of the pope’s superior authority. Beyond this, Ptolemy’s treatment of Otto and Frederick reveals a considerable difference between himself and Martin with regard to their perception of bad emperorship. Martin’s treatment of Frederick for his disrespect toward the Church is harsh, but he is far more disapproving of emperors such as the iconoclasts who led their subjects into heresy. Ptolemy,

⁶⁸ Cf. ‘Hic ab infancia per ecclesiam tamquam per matrem educatus et ad imperii fastigium, Ottone dampnato, promotus, ecclesiam Dei non fovit tamquam matrem, sed tamquam novercam quantum potuit laniavit. Propter quod Honorius papa, qui ipsum coronaverat, sibi rebellem et ecclesie Romane adversarium comperiens, ipsum anathematizavit et omnes barones a sua fidelitate absolvit’, Martin of Opava, *Chronicon*, p. 471.

⁶⁹ ‘Eodem anno Gregorius papa expectans, quod Fredericus ad gremium rediret ecclesie sententiam distulit renovare contra ipsum, sed postea videns benignitatem Dei contempni sequenti anno fulminat contra eum ac sententiam Honorii confirmat et quantum ad excommunicationem et quantum ad depositionem ipsius ab imperiali dignitate’, Ptolemy of Lucca, *Annales*, p. 115. The editor cites Martin as Ptolemy’s source for this passage, but the *Annales* bears little resemblance to the *Chronicon* at this point: ‘Hic sententiam, quam Honorius predecessor suus contra Fredericum fulminaverat, roboravit’, Martin of Opava, *Chronicon*, p. 439.

⁷⁰ Schmeidler notes that Ptolemy made some use of Thomas of Pavia’s *Gesta Imperatorum et Pontificum* (*Annales*, introduction, p. xxiii) which, in its account of Frederick’s reign, also only refers to 1245 as a deposition (‘ad imperio Fredericus deponitur anno Domini 1245’), p. 514. For Frederick’s full reign see Thomas of Pavia, *Gesta Imperatorum et Pontificum*, ed. E. Ehrenfeuchter, MGH, SS, vol. 22, 1872, pp. 510-514. Martin, of course, also refers to deposition only for 1245: ‘...ab Innocencio papa depositus esset ab imperio’, *Chronicon*, p. 471. It is worth noting the use of passive forms (*deponitur* and *depositus esset*) by Thomas and Martin in comparison to Ptolemy’s use of the active *deponit*, which further emphasises the pope’s direct authority.

⁷¹ For the account of Frederick’s reign, see Ptolemy of Lucca, *Historia ecclesiastica nova*, pp. 530-548.

while he labels his worst emperors as ‘persecutors of the Church’,⁷² singles out two recent emperors who clashed with the authority of the Church – the pope – rather than emperors whose ‘persecution’ could be seen as having a profound effect on the souls of the faithful.⁷³ The role of the emperor in Ptolemy’s view appears to be not to rule Christendom alongside the pope, but to obey the pope as a subordinate.

While Bernard’s coverage of emperors is limited, the details he includes about Frederick in particular follow those included in Martin’s *Chronicon*, thereby echoing Martin’s disapproval of the emperor’s relationship with the Church. Bernard includes Martin’s statement that Gregory IX renewed and reinforced a sentence of excommunication against Frederick originally passed down by his predecessor Honorius.⁷⁴ His account of Frederick’s capture of ecclesiastics in 1241 mirrors Martin’s, though he adds the detail of the two captured cardinals’ names, James of Palestrina and Otto of St Nicholas, which he likely found in Vincent of Beauvais.⁷⁵ The coverage of Frederick’s siege of Rome and Gregory’s subsequent call for a crusade against him is taken verbatim from the *Chronicon*.⁷⁶ The only moderations Bernard makes to the *Chronicon*’s material on Frederick is to condense it, suggesting that he likely agreed with Martin’s overall assessment.

Bernard’s treatment of contemporary occupants of the imperial office, however, is more complex. Though his chronicle is focused on and clearly privileges the papacy, Bernard does not criticise Henry VII or Ludwig of Bavaria for their turbulent relationships with the Church in the same way that he does Frederick II. In fact, in the *Flores* he avoids any mention of Henry’s imperial reign, and does not discuss Ludwig at all. The brief imperial chronicle appended to works such as the *Flores* and the *Speculum sanctorale* provides an acknowledgement of Henry VII’s imperial reign that is conspicuously absent from the *Flores* itself. It is worth noting the different audiences for each of the works to which this imperial

⁷² ‘Sed econtra fuerunt alii tres persecutores ecclesie, qui omnes mala morte interierunt’, Ptolemy of Lucca, *De iurisdictione*, pp. 14-15.

⁷³ Ptolemy includes Julian the Apostate in his list of three persecutors in *De iurisdictione* (p. 15). Of the three Julian is the only emperor whom Ptolemy does not discuss further; he is too early to appear in the *Annales*. For the discussion of Otto and Frederick, see *De iurisdictione* pp. 31-33.

⁷⁴ ‘Hic Gregorius papa sententiam quam Honorius, praedecessor suus, tulerat contra Fredericum innovavit et amplius aggravavit’, Bernard Gui, p. 694.

⁷⁵ ‘Cunque concilium Romae celebrare niteretur et a Frederico imperatore viae per mare et per terram arctarentur, duo cardinales, Jacobus Penestrinus et Otho...’, Bernard Gui, pp. 694-695; c.f. ‘Hic cum concilium celebrare Rome nititur, et ab imperatore vie per terram et per mare artantur, duo cardinales et multi prelati...’, Martin of Opava, p. 439. The cardinals are named by Vincent of Beauvais, though the wording of the *Speculum* otherwise bears little resemblance to either Bernard or Martin, suggesting that Bernard consulted both Martin and Vincent. See *Speculum*, book 30, ch. 138, p. 1280.

⁷⁶ See Bernard Gui, p. 695; Martin of Opava, p. 439.

chronicle was appended: despite being drafted as a papal chronicle, Bernard dedicated the final version of the *Flores* to the French king, Philip VI,⁷⁷ while he presented the *Speculum* to Pope John XXII.⁷⁸ The first recension of Bernard's imperial chronicle, which was appended to the *Flores*, concludes with Henry's coronation: 'He was crowned emperor by the three cardinals mentioned above, by special mandate of Pope Clement V in the Basilica of St John Lateran in Rome, on the Feast of the Apostles Peter and Paul in the year of the Lord 1312'.⁷⁹ A note was later added about Henry's death and the transfer of his body to Pisa.⁸⁰ The bulk of Henry's entry in Bernard's chronicle covers the period after he was elected King of the Romans but prior to his imperial coronation. In many recensions, the coverage of the imperial reign itself is limited to his coronation and death.⁸¹ More details of the emperor's controversial reign can, however, be found in Bernard's supplementary imperial chronicle: in particular, recensions which were more likely to find an ecclesiastical audience. The final recension of this imperial chronicle was appended to the *Speculum sanctorale*. A copy of this chronicle shows Bernard including mention of the emperor's excommunication within the body of the chronicle text.⁸² This passage does not appear in earlier chronicles appended to the *Flores*.⁸³ The diplomatic omission of detail concerning Henry in the version appended to the *Flores* supports Jones's suggestion that 'an outright condemnation' of the emperor in the *Flores* itself may have been 'politically insensitive'.⁸⁴ Bernard seems, though, to be more free with his condemnations in a chronicle more likely to reach an audience sympathetic to the pope.⁸⁵ Unlike Martin, whose treatment of papal-imperial conflict is remarkably consistent and follows his vision of the two swords, Bernard's approach is informed by the conflicting sympathies of those to whom he owed loyalty, with no application of his own developed standard of imperial conduct.

This approach is seen further in Bernard's treatment of Henry's successor, Ludwig of Bavaria. The majority of later recensions of the imperial chronicle that included an account of

⁷⁷ Jones, *Eclipse of Empire*, p. 140.

⁷⁸ Guenée, *Between Church and State*, p. 68.

⁷⁹ 'Fuit autem coronatus in imperatorem per tres cardinales superius memoratos, de speciali mandato Clementis papae quinti, Rome, in ecclesia Sancti Johannis Lateranensis, in festo apostolorum Petri et Pauli, anno Domini M. CCC. XII', Bernard Gui, cited in Delisle, *Notices*, p. 240.

⁸⁰ Delisle, p. 241.

⁸¹ Delisle, pp. 241-242.

⁸² Delisle notes that the last recension of the chronicle was appended to the *Speculum*, and provides a list of MSS: pp. 243-244. For an example of the chronicle including commentary on Henry's excommunication, see Paris, BnF, MS Latin 5406, fol. 274^v-275^r.

⁸³ For example, Paris, BnF NAL MS 1171, fol. 133^r, which originally concludes with Henry's coronation, with a later addition for his death and the transfer of his body to Pisa.

⁸⁴ Jones, *Eclipse of Empire*, p. 140.

⁸⁵ In addition to its dedication to the Pope, Bernard undertook the project of the *Speculum* on the orders of the Dominican Master-General: Guenée, *Between Church and State*, p. 60.

Ludwig's reign were appended to the *Speculum* rather than to the *Flores*.⁸⁶ The chapter dedicated to Ludwig first ended with a comment that his many evils had continued to 1329, that is up until the present day, coming to no end.⁸⁷ The following line was later added:

And so after this the aforementioned Ludwig of Bavaria, in the 1329th year after the Incarnation of the Lord, a little before Easter, withdrew, useless, from the city of Parma in Italy and from the whole of Italy, where he accomplished little and was a nuisance to many, [including] himself and the Catholic Church and the peace of the country and commonwealth, and he returned to Germany (Teuthonia).⁸⁸

Bernard's chapter on Ludwig also mentions the papal charges that he had been elected in discord, used his royal titles without papal approval, and aided heretics and other enemies of the Church.⁸⁹ The coverage of Henry and Ludwig suggests an inconsistency in Bernard's approach to papal-imperial conflict, one likely influenced by political considerations and the different audiences for his works. While he is unsurprisingly critical of those emperors who defied the authority of the Church, the extent of his criticism varies. The *Flores* takes little interest in the deeds of individual emperors. Its coverage of Frederick's conflict with the papacy follows Martin's, but reduces it in favour of concentrating on the popes; meanwhile, it avoids mention of any controversy with Henry VII. In the imperial chronicle, where Bernard cannot avoid dedicated coverage of the emperors, he again skims over Henry in recensions that were more often attached to the *Flores*, but includes detail of both Henry and Ludwig's conflicts with the papacy in chronicles that accompanied the *Speculum*. Bernard's reluctance to openly condemn or even discuss papal-imperial conflict in works that are likely to reach an audience sympathetic to the emperor suggests that he is not particularly invested in creating a consistent image of imperial rule, and that it was a topic easily dismissed according to political need.

⁸⁶ Delisle lists four MSS of the *Flores* which include a chapter on Ludwig in the appended imperial chronicle, and twelve of the *Speculum*: *Notices*, pp. 243-244.

⁸⁷ '...de malo in pejus adhuc hodie quo hec scripsimus, inchoante jam anno dominice incarnationis M. CCC. XXIX, nondum enim venit finis malorum ipsorum', Bernard Gui, cited in Delisle, p. 243. This is the end point for BnF MS Latin 5406, fol. 275^v.

⁸⁸ 'Post hec itaque prefatus Ludovicus Baravus, sub anno dominice incarnationis millesimo CCC XXIX, paulo ante Pascha, inefficax discessit de Parma civitate Ytalie et de tota Ytalia, ubi parum profecit multumque obfuit sibi et ecclesie catholice et paci patrie et reipublice, et rediit in Teuthoniam', Bernard Gui, cited in Delisle, p. 243.

⁸⁹ '...electionis facti de ipso in discordia ... per sedem apolostolicam approbata usurpavit [...] regii nominis et augusti ... et favit rebellibus et adversariis ecclesiae [...] Mediolaniensibus et Ferrariensibus et etiam quibus [...] criminis heresis [...] de Mediolano', BnF Latin MS 5406, fol. 275^r. Bernard identifies these particular charges as the ones made on 11 July 1324 ('...in publico consistorio V ides Iulii anno domini M CCC XXIII'). For these proceedings in full see Pope John XXII, *Iohannis XXII. Papae quartus processus contra Ludewicum regem*, ed. J. Schwalm, MGH, *Const.*, vol. 5, Hannover and Leipzig, 1909-1913, pp. 779-788.

The treatment of individual emperors in the chronicles of both Bernard and Ptolemy suggests that a considerable difference exists between their perceptions of emperorship and Martin's. Ptolemy's approach to individual emperors is consistent with his presentation of the empire's subordinate role to the papacy. He pays particular attention to emperors who defied or disrespected the authority of the Church and emphasises the Church's ability to depose them as required. His focus on deposition as a consequence for disobeying papal authority reveals a key difference between himself and Martin, who condemns emperors for persistently defying papal sanctions but rarely uses the language of deposition and does not focus on the triumph of papal power over imperial. Bernard, meanwhile, does not apply a consistent standard to the treatment of papal-imperial conflict in his accounts of Frederick II, Henry VII, and Ludwig of Bavaria despite all three receiving a sentence of excommunication from the pope. The papal orientation of the *Flores* would suggest a similarly condemnatory approach to Ptolemy in the presentation of excommunicated emperors. Instead, Bernard avoids discussion of any controversial aspects of Henry VII and Ludwig's reigns in the *Flores* itself and includes criticism of the emperors' conduct only in the final recension of his supplementary imperial chronicle. His cautious approach reflects the conflicting interests of the papacy and the French court, both of which Bernard owed loyalty, and reveals the impact of these external factors on the way he presents imperial history. While Bernard used Martin's material about Frederick, his inconsistent approach to Henry and Ludwig's conflicts with the papacy reveals that he did not incorporate Martin's vision of papal-imperial relations into his own work, and nor did he seem to apply a developed vision of his own. In their treatment of individual emperors, neither Ptolemy nor Bernard continued Martin's particular concept of the role of the emperor in Christendom. Instead, despite using Martin's material, they offered different interpretations of imperial history that suited their requirements, reflecting the importance of their political loyalties.

* * *

Both Bernard and Ptolemy present a worldview that emphasises the importance and supremacy of the papacy over the empire, and reduces the role of the emperor. Their worldview reflects the unique circumstances of the early fourteenth century and the Dominican Order's absolute loyalty to the pope in religious and political matters. When compared to Martin, both authors represent a notable shift in the balance of power between empire and papacy. Bernard's *Flores* takes papal history as its focal point, minimising the importance of the empire by limiting its coverage of imperial affairs and editing Martin's material to remove mention of the emperor.

Ptolemy's approach to the empire as a whole and to individual emperors in the *Annales* focuses on the greater authority of the papacy and the triumph of this authority over the empire.

Beyond this pro-papal shift, Bernard and Ptolemy reveal markedly different perspectives of the empire. Ptolemy's *Annales* is almost equally concerned with the affairs of the papacy, empire, and city of Lucca, and devotes considerable space to the recording of imperial history. It acknowledges the significance of the empire and the deeds of its rulers, but its content clearly subordinates imperial power to papal and presents a consistent narrative of disobedient emperors being subjected to the pope's greater authority. Bernard, meanwhile, varies his presentation of emperors who came into conflict with popes, avoiding comment entirely on some while condemning others. These differences can be attributed to the political contexts in which each author wrote. Bernard, based in southern France, had to balance his loyalties to his order, the king, and the pope when writing his chronicles. The empire held little significance for him, and he was further able to vary his treatment of imperial history according to political considerations. Northern Italian republics such as Lucca, meanwhile, were torn between the rival Guelph and Ghibelline factions which allied themselves, more or less, with the old universal powers of papacy and empire. Both these powers loomed large in Ptolemy's experience and subsequently in his history. His civil allegiance to Lucca, a Guelph and therefore generally pro-papal city, was combined with his Dominican loyalties to produce a particularly hierocratic outlook.

Some common ground can be found between Martin, Bernard, and Ptolemy. For all three, Frederick's death heralded a vacancy rather than a cessation of the empire. Similarly, German kings needed to receive imperial benediction from the pope before they could rule as emperors. However, questions of the role of the emperor and the position of the empire within Christendom were, ultimately, decided by factors outside the Dominican Order. They were contingent upon each chronicler's experience of imperial power in his own context and ties of loyalty outside the order. Bernard and Ptolemy take material and facts verbatim from Martin while compiling unique histories that reflected their own circumstances. The Dominican historical tradition, therefore, appears to be one that passes knowledge on from brother to brother, but leaves the interpretation of this information open to each chronicler.

Conclusion

This thesis has demonstrated that Martin of Opava occupied a distinct place and represented a distinct view amongst Dominican compilers in the mid-thirteenth to early-fourteenth centuries. While often dismissed as wholly unimaginative and derivative, Martin's *Chronicon* was a new work of synthesis that constructed an image of empire – its rulers, its role, and its history – unique to the chronicler. Martin is undeniably a conservative and pro-papal writer, but these factors have served as grounds for scholars to overlook the complexity and unique aspects of his worldview. His treatment of individual emperors shows a concept of emperorship informed by the writings of the Church Fathers which treat the Christian emperor as the embodiment of the Church's 'material sword' in conjunction with the pope's 'spiritual sword', with the role of enforcing law and expanding the territory of Christendom. He goes beyond these patristic ideas in his treatment of imperial piety, where he shows a particular interest in heresy and orthodoxy and prioritises the inclusion of the impact of imperial piety – and impiety – on the Christian community as a whole through accounts of church foundation, the acquisition of relics, and the persecution of orthodox Catholics by heretical emperors.

In his presentation of papal-imperial relations, Martin subscribes to a dualist interpretation of the 'two swords' concept that assigns equal importance to pope and emperor within their respective spheres. This challenges assumptions by scholars who have categorised Martin as a hierocrat, likely on the basis of his allegiance to the papacy or a misinterpretation of his conventional comments on the greater 'dignity' of papal power. On the contrary, Martin emphasises the equal importance and authority of papacy and empire throughout the *Chronicon* and presents a model of ideal papal-imperial cooperation in Pope Sylvester and Constantine. His treatment of conflict between empire and papacy reveals the careful balance he strikes between maintaining his dualist vision and presenting a history favourable to the papacy. Papal-imperial conflict in the *Chronicon* is caused by an emperor's transgression against the Church, for which the pope can rightfully censure the emperor with excommunication; it is only repeated denial of the pope's spiritual authority, however, that earns a forceful condemnation from Martin. The defiance of excommunication, the function of the pope's spiritual sword, threatens the 'two swords' model and therefore the rightful balance of power.

The *Chronicon*, overall, presents a developed, coherent, and consistent vision of the role of empire and emperor in Christendom. While the pope holds the spiritual sword, the emperor is an indispensable figure in the dual governance of the Church. If wielded properly, the Christian emperor's power advances the mission of the Church through the administration

of justice, the expansion of borders, the promotion and modelling of orthodoxy, and the facilitation of popular devotion through acts of piety including the acquisition of relics and the foundation of monasteries and churches.

The Dominican Order left a clear mark on Martin's thought, with the conservative and orthodox nature of its education system reflected in a chronicle that preserved a traditional understanding of the place of empire within Christendom. Yet the influence of the Order on Martin's thought did more than produce a straightforward alignment with traditional ideas. Elements of the Order's key pastoral mission informed Martin's treatment of imperial piety. This particular focus, despite its alignment with the concerns of Dominican ministry, was not shared by Martin's contemporaries Vincent of Beauvais and James of Voragine. Through comparisons between Martin's presentation of imperial history and that of his brethren in the Order, this thesis has revealed both the impact and the limitations of Dominican influence. Differences in the brothers' geographic backgrounds and patronage contributed to diverse interpretations of imperial history. While there are some similarities in their conception of empire, such as the belief in a continuous Roman empire that follows the 'four monarchies' theory and a shared interest in an emperor's heresy or orthodoxy, a comparison of Martin and his contemporary compilers reveals the absence of a cohesive, shared vision of empire and Christian emperorship within the Dominican Order in the mid-thirteenth century.

The absence of common ground is equally evident in the reception and use of Martin's *Chronicon* by Ptolemy of Lucca and Bernard Gui in the early fourteenth century. Both friars, while using Martin as a source, compiled chronicles that presented the empire in vastly different ways to Martin. The *Chronicon*'s careful construction of an equal balance of power between empire and papacy disappeared in both the *Annales* and the *Flores chronicorum*. Ptolemy took a 'hierocratic' view that, while granting similar attention to empire and papacy, was careful to demonstrate the superior authority of papacy over empire. Bernard, meanwhile, sidelined the empire to present a vision of Christian history centred on the papacy alone as a universal power. Both chroniclers' concepts of empire reflect their unique contexts and there is little continuation of Martin's ideas. As with Martin and his thirteenth-century contemporaries, the sole common thread between Martin, Ptolemy, and Bernard regarding empire is the belief in its continued existence. Beyond this, its importance and function is open to interpretation.

The diversity of the Dominican Order's members that so concerned Humbert of Romans is evident in the different approaches taken by Martin, Vincent, James, Ptolemy, and Bernard to the concept of empire and Christian emperorship. Despite belonging to the same Order, and despite the levels of textual interaction between them – Martin and James drawing from Vincent, Ptolemy and Bernard drawing from Martin, Bernard drawing from Ptolemy and Vincent as well as Martin – there is little in common between these five friars' interpretations of empire. Even when borrowing material from a fellow Dominican, each compiler abridged, rearranged, or otherwise edited his sources to create a particular vision of empire that reflected his own experiences and obligations.

This thesis has shown that, within his religious context, Martin constructed a vision of empire that was distinctly his own in the *Chronicon*. His subscription to a traditional dualist model of power, his connection to the papacy, and his ostensive project to produce a straightforward account of papal-imperial history have masked the original elements of his interpretation from scholars. The Dominican Order produced a variety of universal histories between the mid-thirteenth and early-fourteenth centuries. The differences between Martin's work and others within this connected historiographical tradition attest to a complex and deliberate editorial process that reflected Martin's own distinct perspective.

While this thesis has explored the ideas of other near-contemporary Dominican chroniclers in relation to Martin, there is still substantial research to be done in this area. A more comprehensive study of empire in Dominican compilations, drawing from a wider source base, may identify patterns of thought common to particular provinces or regions or identify broader changes over time. Similarly, a comparative approach with Franciscan chronicles and compilations, particularly early fourteenth-century texts such as the *Flores temporum*,¹ the chronicles of Paulinus of Venice,² and the *Chronicon pontificum et imperatorum Ratisponense*,³ may highlight similarities and differences between Dominican and Franciscan concepts of empire at a time when the loyalties of both mendicant orders were becoming increasingly politicised. Beyond the concept of empire, studies of Martin's other works, such

¹ This chronicle was composed around the turn of the century and drew predominantly from Martin: see H. Kümper, 'Flores temporum', in Dunphy (ed.), *Encyclopedia of the Medieval Chronicle*, vol. 1, p. 625.

² Paulinus compiled three universal chronicles in the first half of the fourteenth century: the *Notabilium historiarum Epithoma*, the *Chronologia magna*, and the *Satirica rerum gestarum mundi ystoria*. See E. R. Daniel, 'Paulinus of Venice', in Dunphy (ed.), *Encyclopedia of the Medieval Chronicle*, vol. 2, pp. 1193-1194.

³ This chronicle was compiled 'probably by a Franciscan who was hostile to the Dominicans': M. Weber, 'Chronicon pontificum et imperatorum Ratisponense', in Dunphy (ed.), *Encyclopedia of the Medieval Chronicle*, vol. 1, p. 397.

as his sermons, may further contribute to our understanding of his thought and, in doing so, contribute to recovering the perspectives of a Dominican friar who has not typically received much scholarly attention.

Martin of Opava was – as Bernard Gui and his contemporaries recognised – a singularly important chronicler of the later Middle Ages. Scholarship to date has recognised his importance and popularity, often somewhat begrudgingly, while dismissing his value to modern historians, or has assumed that the *Chronicon*'s apparent lack of sophistication was a major part of its appeal. But this attitude does both Martin and his medieval readers a disservice. Martin's complex and consistent presentation of imperial history in the *Chronicon* reveals a chronicler who had his own distinct perspective on the great powers that shaped his world, as well as a thorough understanding of his craft which enabled him to shape history according to his vision. Later chroniclers did not simply find and follow the vision of empire Martin had laid out before them: they selected, adapted, and recreated aspects of the *Chronicon* as they saw fit, ensuring that the empire as it appeared in Dominican chronicles was as dynamic and mutable as the concept itself.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Manuscripts

Paris, BnF MS Latin 5406.

Paris, BnF NAL MS 1171.

Edited Texts

Annales Regni Francorum, ed. F. Kurze, MGH, SS rer. Germ., vol. 6, Hannover, 1895.

Augustine of Hippo, *The City of God Against the Pagans*, trans. R. W. Dyson, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Bernard Gui, *Flores chronicorum*, ed. J. D. Guignaut and N. de Wailly, RHGF, vol. 21, Paris, Imprimerie impériale, 1855, pp. 690-734.

Early Dominicans: Selected Writings, ed. S. Tugwell, O. P., London, SPCK, 1982.

Gilbert of Rome, *Chronicon Pontificum et Imperatorum Romanorum*, ed. O. Holder-Egger, MGH, SS, vol. 24, Hannover, 1879, pp. 119-140.

Historia Diplomatica Friderici Secundi, vol. 5, ed. J. L. A. Huillard-Bréholes, Paris, Plon, 1857.

Humbert of Romans, *Super constitutiones*, trans. S. Tugwell, in S. Tugwell (ed.), *Early Dominicans: Selected Writings*, London, SPCK, 1982, pp. 141-145.

James of Voragine, *Legenda aurea*, vol. 2, ed. G. P. Maggioni, Florence, SISMEL – Edizioni del Galluzzo, 2007.

Liber pontificalis, vol. 1, ed. L. Duchesne, Paris, Libraire des ecoles françaises d'athenes et de rome, 1886.

Martin of Opava, *Chronicon Pontificum et Imperatorum*, ed. L. Weiland, MGH, SS, vol. 22, Hannover, 1872, pp. 377-475.

Orosius, *Historiarum adversum paganos libri VII*, ed. K. F. W. Zangemeister, Leipzig, Teubner, 1889.

Paul of Bernried, *Vita Gregorii VII*, ed. J. M. Watterich, *Pontificum Romanum Vitae*, vol. 1, Leipzig, Engelmann, 1862, pp. 474-546.

Peter Comestor, *Historia Scholastica*, ed. J. P. Migne, in *Patrologia Latina*, vol. 198, 1853, cols. 1045-1721.

Pope Gregory VII, *Epistolae Vagantes*, ed. H. E. J. Cowdrey, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1972.

Pope John XXII, *Iohannis XXII. Papae quartus processus contra Ludewicum regem*, ed. J. Schwalm, MGH, *Const.*, vol. 5, Hannover and Leipzig, 1909-1913, pp. 779-788.

Ptolemy of Lucca, *Annales*, ed. B. Schneidler, MGH, SS. Rer. Germ. N.S., vol. 8, Berlin, 1930.

- Ptolemy of Lucca, *De iurisdictione imperii*, ed. M. Krammer, MGH, *Fontes iuris*, vol. 1, Hannover, 1909.
- Ptolemy of Lucca, *Historia ecclesiastica nova*, ed. L. Schmutge, MGH, SS, vol. 39, 2009.
- Rigord, *Gesta Philippi Augusti*, ed. É. Carpentier, G. Pon and Y. Chauvin, Paris, CNRS Éditions, 2006.
- Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum Medii Aevi*, ed. T. Kaepelli, O. P., 4 vols., Rome, Istituto Storico Domenicano, 1970.
- The Chronicles of Rome: An Edition of the Middle English Chronicle of Popes and Emperors and the Lollard Chronicle*, ed. D. Embree, Woodbridge, Boydell Press, 1999.
- Thomas Aquinas, *Political Writings*, ed. R. W. Dyson, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Thomas of Pavia, *Gesta Imperatorum et Pontificum*, ed. E. Ehrenfeuchter, MGH, SS, vol. 22, 1872, pp. 483-528.
- Vincent of Beauvais, *Libellus apologeticus*, ed. A. D. von den Brincken, in A. D. von den Brincken, 'Geschichtsbetrachtung bei Vincenz von Beauvais: Die Apologia Actoris zum Speculum Maius', *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters*, vol. 34, 1978, pp. 465-499.
- Vincent of Beauvais, *Speculum historiale*, Benedictines of Saint-Vaast d'Arras (ed.), *Bibliotheca mundi, seu venerabilis viri Vincentii Burgundi ex ordine Praedicatorum, episcopi Bellovacensis, Speculum quadruplex, naturale, doctrinale, morale, historiale*, vol. 4, Douai, B. Belleri, 1624.

Secondary Sources

- Abulafia, D., *Frederick II: A Medieval Emperor*, London, Penguin, 1988.
- Allen, M. I., 'Universal History 300-1000', in D. M. Deliyannis (ed.), *Historiography in the Middle Ages*, Leiden, Brill, 2003, pp. 17-42.
- Althoff, G., *Otto III*, trans. P. G. Jestice, University Park, PA., Pennsylvania State University Press, 2003.
- Barracough, G., *The Medieval Papacy*, London, Thames & Hudson, 1968.
- Bellen, H., *Politik – Recht – Gesellschaft: Studien zur Alten Geschichte*, Stuttgart, Steiner, 1997.
- Benson, R. L., 'Political *Renovatio*: Two Models from Roman Antiquity', in R. L. Benson and G. Constable (ed.), *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century*, Cambridge, M. A., Harvard University Press, 1982, pp. 339-386.
- Benson, R. L., 'The Gelasian Doctrine: Uses and Transformations', in G. Makdisi, D. Sourdel, and J. Sourdel-Thomine (ed.), *La notion d'autorité au Moyen Age: Islam, Byzance, Occident*, Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1982, pp. 13-44.

- Black, A., *Political Thought in Europe: 1250-1450*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Blythe, J. M., *The Life and Works of Tolomeo Fiadoni (Ptolemy of Lucca)*, Turnhout, Brepols, 2009.
- Blythe, J. M., *The Worldview and Thought of Tolomeo Fiadoni (Ptolemy of Lucca)*, Turnhout, Brepols, 2009.
- Bratu, C., 'Gilbertus Romanus', in G. Dunphy (ed.), *Encyclopedia of the Medieval Chronicle*, vol. 1, Leiden, Brill, 2010, p. 706.
- Brooke, R. B., *The Coming of the Friars*, London, Allen & Unwin, 1975.
- Brown, E. A. R., 'Vincent de Beauvais and the *reditus regni francorum ad stirpem Caroli imperatoris*', in M. Paulmier-Foucart, S. Lusignan, and A. Nadeau, (ed.), *Vincent de Beauvais: Intentions et réceptions d'une œuvre encyclopédique au Moyen-Âge*, Paris, Vrin, 1990, pp. 167-196.
- Brown, E. A. R., and Cothren, M. W., 'The Twelfth-Century Crusading Window of the Abbey of Saint-Denis: *Praeteritorum enim recordatio futurorum est exhibitio*', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, vol. 49, 1986, pp. 1-40.
- Burr, D., 'Effects of the Spiritual Franciscan Controversy on the Mendicant Ideal', in D. Prudlo (ed.), *Origin, Development, and Refinement of Medieval Religious Mendicancies*, Leiden, Brill, 2011, pp. 277-305.
- Burrow, J., *A History of Histories: Epics, Chronicles, Romances and Inquiries from Herodotus and Thucydides to the Twentieth Century*, London, Allen Lane, 2007.
- Canning, J., 'Introduction: Politics, Institutions and Ideas', in J. H. Burns (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Medieval Political Thought c. 350-1450*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1988, pp. 341-366.
- Canning, J., *A History of Medieval Political Thought 300-1450*, 2nd edn., Routledge, London, 2005.
- Carlyle, R. W. and Carlyle, A. J., *A History of Mediaeval Political Theory in the West*, vol. 5, 3rd edn., Edinburgh, William Blackwood & Sons, 1950.
- Chadwick, H., 'Christian doctrine', in J. H. Burns (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Medieval Political Thought c. 350-1450*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1988, pp. 11-20.
- Chazan, M., *L'Empire et l'histoire universelle de Sigebert de Gembloux à Jean de Saint-Victor*, Paris, Honoré Champion, 1999.
- Chazan, M., 'La méthode critique des historiens dans les chroniques universelles médiévales', in M. Chazan and G. Dahan (ed.), *La méthode critique au Moyen Âge*, Turnhout, Brepols, 2006, pp. 223-256.
- Clark, M. J., *The Making of the Historia Scholastica, 1150-1200*, Toronto, Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2015.

- Clavuot, O., 'Ptolemy of Lucca', in G. Dunphy (ed.), *Encyclopedia of the Medieval Chronicle*, vol. 2, Leiden, Brill, 2010, pp. 1245-1246.
- Cole, Z., 'Representations of Rulership in the *Legenda Aurea*', unpublished Honours dissertation, University of Canterbury, 2017. Permanent link: <http://hdl.handle.net/10092/15007>.
- Cowdrey, H. E. J., *Pope Gregory VII: 1073-1085*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1998.
- Daniel, E. R., 'Paulinus of Venice', in G. Dunphy (ed.), *Encyclopedia of the Medieval Chronicle*, vol. 2, Leiden, Brill, 2010, pp. 1193-1194.
- Davis, R., 'Introduction', in R. Davis (ed.), *The Book of Pontiffs: The ancient biographies of the first ninety Roman bishops to AD 715*, 2nd edn., Liverpool, Liverpool University Press, 2000, pp. xi-l.
- de Souza, G. Q., 'Heraclius, emperor of Byzantium', *Revista Digital de Iconografia Medieval*, vol. 7, no. 14, 2015, pp. 27-38.
- Delisle, L., 'Notice sur les manuscrits de Bernard Gui', *Notices et extraits des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque nationale et autres bibliothèques*, vol. 27, part 2, Paris, Imprimerie nationale, 1879, pp. 169-455.
- Deliyannis, D., 'Liber pontificalis', in G. Dunphy (ed.), *Encyclopedia of the Medieval Chronicle*, vol. 2, Leiden, Brill, 2010, p. 1028.
- Dubreil-Arcin, A., *Vies de saints, légendes de soi: L'écriture hagiographique dominicaine jusqu'au Speculum sanctorale de Bernard Gui († 1331)*, Turnhout, Brepols, 2011.
- Dunbabin, J., *Charles I of Anjou: Power, Kingship and State-Making in Thirteenth-Century Europe*, London, Longman, 1998.
- Dunbabin, J., 'The Distinctive Elements Among Godfrey of Viterbo's Political Ideas', in T. Foerster (ed.), *Godfrey of Viterbo and His Readers: Imperial Tradition and Universal History in Late Medieval Europe*, Farnham, Ashgate, 2015, pp. 37-46.
- Epstein, S., *The Talents of Jacopo Da Varagine: A Genoese Mind in Medieval Europe*, Ithaca, N.Y., Cornell University Press, 2016.
- Foerster, T., 'Introduction', in T. Foerster (ed.), *Godfrey of Viterbo and His Readers: Imperial Tradition and Universal History in Late Medieval Europe*, Farnham, Ashgate, 2015, pp. 1-12.
- Folz, R., *The Concept of Empire in Western Europe from the Fifth to the Fourteenth Century*, trans. S. A. Ogilvie, London, Edward Arnold, 1969.
- Gabriele, M., *An Empire of Memory: The Legend of Charlemagne, the Franks, and Jerusalem before the First Crusade*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Given-Wilson, C., *Chronicles: The Writing of History in Medieval England*, London, Hambledon and London, 2004.

- Goetz, H., 'The "methodology" of medieval chroniclers', in J. M. Bak and I. Jurković (ed.), *Chronicon: Medieval Narrative Sources: A Chronological Guide with Introductory Essays*, Turnhout, Brepols, 2013, pp. 25-33.
- Guenée, B., *Between Church and State: The Lives of Four French Prelates in the Late Middle Ages*, trans. A. Goldhammer, Chicago, Chicago University Press, 1991.
- Hamilton-Bleakley, H., 'Thomas Aquinas, Political Thought' in H. Lagerlund (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Medieval Philosophy*, Dordrecht, Springer, 2011, pp. 1287-1290.
- Hay, D., *Annalists and Historians*, London, Methuen, 1977.
- Herde, P., 'From Adolf of Nassau to Lewis of Bavaria, 1292-1347', in M. Jones (ed.), *The New Cambridge Medieval History*, vol. 6, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2000, pp. 515-550.
- Holloway, A., 'Early Dominican Exempla Collections: Defining a Method of Ethical Pedagogy', unpublished PhD thesis, Monash University, 2015.
- Ikas, W., 'Martinus Polonus' Chronicle of the Popes and Emperors: A Medieval Best-Seller and Its Neglected Influence on Medieval English Chroniclers', *The English Historical Review*, vol. 116, no. 466, 2001, pp. 327-341.
- Jones, C., '...mais tot por le servise Deu? Philippe III le Hardi, Charles d'Anjou and the 1273/74 Imperial Candidature', *Viator*, vol. 34, 2003, pp. 208-228.
- Jones, C., *Eclipse of Empire? Perceptions of the Empire and its Rulers in Late-Medieval France*, Turnhout, Brepols, 2007.
- Jones, C., 'Understanding Political Conceptions in the Later Middle Ages: The French Imperial Candidates and the Idea of the Nation-State', *Viator*, vol. 42, no. 2, 2011, pp. 83-114.
- Jones, C., 'Geoffroi of Courlon and Political Perceptions in Late Medieval France', *Viator*, vol. 47, no. 1, 2015, pp. 153-189.
- Jones, C., 'Historical Understanding and the Nature of Temporal Power in the Thought of John of Paris', in C. Jones (ed.), *John of Paris: Beyond Royal and Papal Power*, Turnhout, Brepols, 2015, pp. 77-111.
- Jones, C., 'Undefined Terms: Empires and Emperors in Late Medieval French Thought', *The Medieval History Journal*, vol. 20, no. 2, 2017, pp. 319-353.
- Jones, C., 'Diener zweier Herren? Jean Quidort und das Problem der königlichen Autorität', *Jahrbuch für Universitätsgeschichte*, vol. 19, 2016[18], pp. 153-187.
- Jostkleigrew, G., '"Rex imperator in regno suo" – An Ideology of Frenchness? Late Medieval France, Its Political Elite and Juridicial Discourses', in A. Pleszczyński, J. Sobiesiak, M. Tomaszek, and P. Tyszka (ed.), *Imagined Communities: Constructing Collective Identities in Medieval Europe*, Leiden, Brill, 2018, pp. 46-82.

- Karahan, A., 'Byzantine Iconoclasm: Ideology and Quest for Power', in K. Kolrud and M. Prusac (ed.), *Iconoclasm from Antiquity to Modernity*, Farnham, Ashgate, 2014, pp. 75-94.
- Kehne, P., 'Pax Augusta' in H. Canick, H. Schneider and C. F. Salazar (ed.), *Brill's New Pauly: Encyclopaedia of the Ancient World: Antiquity*, vol. 10, Leiden, Brill, 2007, p. 658.
- Kelly, J. N. D., *The Oxford Dictionary of Popes*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Kienzle, B. M., *Cistercians, Heresy and Crusade in Occitania, 1145-1229*, York, York Medieval Press, 2001.
- King, P. D., 'The barbarian kingdoms', in J. H. Burns (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Medieval Political Thought*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1988, pp. 123-153.
- Krynen, J., "'Rex Christianissimus": A medieval theme at the roots of French absolutism', *History and anthropology*, vol. 4, no. 1, 1989, pp. 79-96.
- Kümper, H., 'Flores temporum', in G. Dunphy (ed.), *Encyclopedia of the Medieval Chronicle*, vol. 1, Leiden, Brill, 2010, p. 625.
- Lake, J., 'Current Approaches to Medieval Historiography', *History Compass*, vol. 13, no. 3, 2015, pp. 89-109.
- Lamarrigue, A. M., *Bernard Gui (1261-1331): Un historien et sa méthode*, Paris, Honoré Champion, 2000.
- Lappin, A. J., 'From Osma to Bologna, From Canons to Friars, From the Preaching to the Preachers: The Dominican Path Towards Mendicancy', in D. Prudlo (ed.), *The Origin, Development and Refinement of Medieval Religious Mendicancies*, Leiden, Brill, 2011, pp. 31-58.
- Larner, J., *Italy in the Age of Dante and Petrarch: 1216-1380*, London, Longman, 1980.
- Latowsky, A. A., *Emperor of the World: Charlemagne and the Construction of Imperial Authority*, Ithaca, N.Y., Cornell University Press, 2013.
- Lawrence, C. H., *The Friars: The Impact of the Early Mendicant Movement on Western Society*, London, Longman, 1994.
- Le Goff, J., *In Search of Sacred Time: Jacobus de Voragine and the Golden Legend*, trans. L. G. Cochrane, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 2014.
- Matthews, W., 'Martinus Polonus and some later Chroniclers', in D.A. Pearsall and R. A. Waldron (ed.), *Medieval Literature and Civilization: Studies in Memory of G. N. Garmonsway*, London, University of London Athlone Press, 1969, pp. 275-288.
- McIlwain, C. H., *The Growth of Political Thought in the West: From the Greeks to the End of the Middle Ages*, New York, Macmillan, 1932.

- Mierau, H. J., 'Das Reich, Politische Theorien und die Heilsgeschichte: Zur Ausbildung eines Reichsbewußtseins durch die Papst-Kaiser-Chroniken des Spätmittelalters', *Zeitschrift für Historische Forschung*, vol. 32, no. 4, 2005, pp. 543-573.
- Mierau, H. J., 'Die Einheit des imperium Romanum in den Papst-Kaiser-Chroniken des Spätmittelalters', *Historische Zeitschrift*, vol. 282, no. 2, 2006, pp. 281-312.
- Minnis, A., 'Nolens auctor sed compiler reputari: The Late-Medieval Discourse of Compilation', in M. Chazan and G. Dahan (ed.), *La méthode critique au Moyen Âge*, Turnhout, Brepols, 2006, pp. 47-63.
- Moorhead, J., *Theoderic in Italy*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1992.
- Morris, C., *The Papal Monarchy: The Western Church from 1050-1250*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1989.
- Mulchahey, M. M., *First the Bow is Bent in Study: Dominican Education Before 1350*, Toronto, Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1998.
- Muldoon, J., *Empire and Order: The Concept of Empire, 800-1800*, Basingstoke, Macmillan, 1999.
- Nelson, J., 'Kingship and Empire', in J. H. Burns (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Medieval Political Thought*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1988, pp. 211-251.
- Noble, T. F. X., *Images, Iconoclasm, and the Carolingians*, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009.
- Parker, T., 'A Woman's Role: How Scribes Depicted Women on the Fifteenth-Century Canterbury Roll', *Comitatus*, vol. 48, 2017, pp. 95-115.
- Paulmier-Foucart, M., and Duchenne, M., *Vincent de Beauvais et le Grand miroir du monde*, Turnhout, Brepols, 2004.
- Paulmier-Foucart, M., and Lusignan, S., 'Vincent de Beauvais et l'histoire du Speculum Maius', *Journal des savants*, 1990, pp. 97-124.
- Pennington, K., *The Prince and the Law, 1200-1600: Sovereignty and Rights in the Western Legal Tradition*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1993.
- Peters, E., *The Shadow King: Rex Inutilis in Medieval Law and Literature, 751-1327*, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1970.
- Potter, D., *Constantine the Emperor*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Rech, R., 'Bernard Gui', in G. Dunphy (ed.), *Encyclopedia of the Medieval Chronicle*, vol. 1, Leiden, Brill, 2010, pp. 170-172.
- Regan, G., *First Crusader: Byzantium's Holy Wars*, Gloucestershire, Sutton Publishing, 2001.
- Robinson, I. S., 'Church and papacy', in J. H. Burns (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Medieval Political Thought c. 350-1450*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1988, pp. 252-305.

- Roest, B., 'Late Medieval Institutional History' in D. M. Deliyannis (ed.), *Historiography in the Middle Ages*, Leiden, Brill, 2003, pp. 277-316.
- Rolston, E., 'The Imperial Character: Alexius I and Ideal Emperors in Twelfth-Century Byzantium', *Parergon*, vol. 35, no. 1, 2018, pp. 17-34.
- Scales, L., *The Shaping of German Identity: Authority and Crisis, 1245-1414*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- Schenck, M. J., 'Constantine, St. Sylvester, and Charlemagne: Iconography of *Regnum et Sacerdotium* in the Sylvester Window at Chartres', in P. E. Bennett, L. Z. Morgan, and F. R. Psaki (ed.), *The Epic Imagination in Medieval Literature: Essays in Honor of Alice M. Colby-Hall*, University, MS., University of Mississippi, 2016, pp. 89-111.
- Schimmelpfennig, B., *The Papacy*, New York, Columbia University Press, 1992.
- Sisson, K., 'Popes over Princes: Hierocratic Theory', in K. Sisson and A. A. Larson (ed.), *A Companion to the Medieval Papacy: Growth of an Ideology and Institution*, Leiden, Brill, 2016, pp. 121-132.
- Sommerlechner, A., *Stupor Mundi? Kaiser Friedrich II. und die mittelalterliche Geschichtsschreibung*, Vienna, Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1999.
- Sot, M., 'Local and Institutional History (300-1000)', in D. M. Deliyannis (ed.), *Historiography in the Middle Ages*, Leiden, Brill, 2003, pp. 89-114.
- Sprandel, R., 'World Historiography in the Late Middle Ages', trans. K. E. Thomas, in D. M. Deliyannis (ed.), *Historiography in the Middle Ages*, Leiden, Brill, 2003, pp. 157-179.
- Stuckey, J., 'Charlemagne as Crusader?: Memory, Propaganda, and the Many Uses of Charlemagne's Legendary Expedition to Spain', in M. Gabriele and J. Stuckey (ed.), *The Legend of Charlemagne in the Middle Ages: Power, Faith, and Crusade*, New York, Palgrave, 2008, pp. 137-152.
- Tamas, H., 'Valentinian I, *christianissimus imperator*? Notes on a passage of the *Passio Pollionis* (BHL 6869)', *Vigiliae Christianiae*, vol. 68, 2014, pp. 82-97.
- Thompson, J. W., *A History of Historical Writing*, vol. 1, New York, Macmillan, 1942.
- Traver, A., 'The Forging of an Intellectual Defense of Mendicancy in the Medieval University', in D. Prudlo (ed.), *The Origin, Development and Refinement of Medieval Religious Mendicancies*, Leiden, Brill, 2011, pp. 157-195.
- Uckelman, S. L., 'Logic and the Condemnations of 1277', *Journal of Philosophical Logic*, vol. 39, no. 2, 2010, pp. 201-227.
- Ullmann, W., *The Growth of Papal Government in the Middle Ages: A study in the ideological relation of clerical to lay power*, 2nd edn., London, Methuen, 1965.
- Ullmann, W., *Medieval Political Thought*, Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1975.
- Von den Brincken, A. D., 'Martin von Troppau (Martinus Polonus)', in Kurt Ruh et al. (ed.), *Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters: Verfasserlexikon*, vol. 6, Berlin, Walter de Gruyter, 1987, pp. 158-166.

- Von den Brincken, A. D., 'In una pagina ponendo pontifices, in alia pagina imperatores: Das Kopien der tabellarischen Papst-Kaiser-Chronik des Martin von Troppau', *Revue d'histoire des textes*, vol. 18, 1988, pp. 109-136.
- Von den Brincken, A. D., 'Martin of Opava', in G. Dunphy (ed.), *Encyclopedia of the Medieval Chronicle*, vol. 2, Leiden, Brill, 2010, pp. 1085-1088.
- Waley, D., *The Italian City-Republics*, 3rd edn., London, Longman, 1988.
- Watt, J. A., 'The Theory of Papal Monarchy in the Thirteenth Century: The Contribution of the Canonists', *Traditio*, vol. 20, 1964, pp. 179-317.
- Watt, J. A., 'Spiritual and temporal powers', in J. H. Burns (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Medieval Political Thought*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1988, pp. 367-423.
- Watts, J., *The Making of Politics: Europe 1300-1500*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Weber, M., 'Chronicon pontificum et imperatorum Ratisponense', in G. Dunphy (ed.), *Encyclopedia of the Medieval Chronicle*, vol. 1, Leiden, Brill, 2010, p. 397.
- Wei, I. P., *Intellectual Culture in Medieval Paris: Theologians and the University, c. 1100-1330*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- Whaley, D. R., 'The Wilted Lily: Representations of the Greater Capetian Dynasty within the Vernacular Tradition of Saint-Denis, 1274-1461', unpublished PhD thesis, University of Canterbury, 2018. Permanent link: <http://hdl.handle.net/10092/15052>.
- White, K., 'The *Quodlibeta* of Thomas Aquinas in the Context of His Work', in C. Schabel (ed.), *Theological Quodlibeta in the Middle Ages: The Thirteenth Century*, Leiden, Brill, 2005, pp. 49-133.
- Wilks, M., *The Problem of Sovereignty in the Later Middle Ages: The Papal Monarchy with Augustinus Triumphus and the Publicists*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1963.
- Wilson, P. H., *The Holy Roman Empire: A Thousand Years of Europe's History*, London, Penguin, 2017.
- Winkelmann, F., 'Historiography in the Age of Constantine', in G. Marasco (ed.), *Greek and Roman Historiography in Late Antiquity: Fourth to Sixth Century A.D.*, Leiden, Brill, 2003, pp. 3-41.
- Wolfram, H., 'Martin of Troppau', in *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. 9, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1967, p. 304.

